1608/1739
1-4 1

A DEFENCE OF *Engliſh* Hiſtory, AGAINST THE Miſrepreſentations OF M. *de Rapin Thoyras*, IN HIS Hiſtory of *ENGLAND*,

Now publiſhing Weekly.

LONDON:

Printed for J. WILFORD, at the *Three Flower-de-Luces*, behind the *Chapter-Houſe* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard. 1734.

[Price 2*s*.]

M. *de Rapin Thoyras*

EXAMINED,

Both as to His

Knowledge of HISTORY,

And His

Integrity in Writing it.

THAT Truth is the moſt worthy of our Search, and Knowledge the higheſt Attainment of our Nature, is univerſally allowed. If it were to be proved, it is enough to obſerve, that Falſhood ever puts on the Dreſs of Truth, in order to paſs upon Mankind. Knowledge of Truth is indeed the Foundation and Rule of Virtue.

IT is worth enquiring, how our Hiſtories came to be contradictory and falſe. If they are contradictory, ſome of them muſt be falſe: I mean our general Hiſtories, which are a Col-

lection from particular Writers. This may be reſolved into Ignorance or Intereſt; into Ignorance real or affected. It is a Work too great for the Life of *Methuſalem*, to read and digeſt all that have wrote before him: And it were fitter to employ ſeventy Pens than a ſingle one. This brings them under neceſſity of admitting Things without juſt Examination, and relying upon others as much in Haſte as themſelves. If we were ſo happy to ſee the Province divided, a certain Period allotted to an Author, who ſhould give us the various Readings, we might expect a more perfect Performance: And the Biaſs under which one ſingle Writer labours, could not influence the whole.

THE next Grievance is, affected Ignorance, or want of Fidelity. *Magiſter artis ingenique largitor Venter*, ſaith, *Perſius*; which may be tranſlated, *The Belly has no Ears.* He that is *Swiſs* to a Publiſher, muſt conſult the Palate of his Buyers. The Majority of theſe read Hiſtory, not for the Sake of Improvement from the Example of earlier Ages, nor for innocent Paſtime; but to confirm themſelves in ſome Practices defended by their Hiſtorian, and to pick up Objections to Truth. He ſells them *Artificial Eyes*, which may be had as well in St. *Paul*'s Church-yard as at *Ludgate*.

IF a Number of learned Men were to review the Hiſtories we have, after the Manner of Dr. *Prideaux* and Sir *Iſaac Newton*, we might hope to arrrive at ſomething better than a Novel or Romance.

IN Excuſe for ſome *Swiſs* Writers it may be ſaid, that, beſides a Maintenance, they had a View to ſtand in Golden Letters and Glaſs Caſes; and that, by Inſtinct, they were determin'd

BRITISH MUSEUM 28 70 FEB

min'd to grand Atchievements: Thus we may interpret,

——— *Æqua lege neceſſitas*
Sortitur inſignes & imos. Hor.

I NEED not make any farther Apology for the Freedom I take with the Hiſtory of *England* publiſh'd under the Name of *De Rapin Thoyras*. That he neither could have told us Truth if he would, or would have told it if he could, appears from his Incapacity and his induſtrious Miſrepreſentation of Facts. It is hard to conceive that a Foreigner, in ſo few Years Knowledge of *Engliſh* Affairs, ſhould be Maſter of the Subject he writes upon. And, perhaps, 'tis the beſt Defence of him to ſay, there were more Heads than his clubbing for the Performance. He or they might think that, beſides the Profit of the Work, it was a meritorious Act to bring over the unconverted Part of the Nation to thoſe Sentiments themſelves had imbib'd through Ignorance or Intereſt. They have indeed a Majority of Voices, if we take our Modern Hiſtorians by Number, not by Weight. But it is aſſuming too much, to diſparage and vilify our beſt Authors, to make room for their Schemes: To bring an Odium upon the moſt learned and faithful of our Hiſtorians, from Motives of Spite and Pretences of Hearſay. They who bring their Vouchers, are now to be diſregarded, and their Relations exploded by Clamour and Suſpicion!

THE Introduction to *Rapin* gives fair Warning what he deſigns to be at *. If he had thought of ſome of his Readers, he had better

* Page 6.

have put the Obſervation into the middle of the Book, where none of them would ever have ſeen it. But he had a mind to ſhew to the greateſt Number his Talents at firſt; that he is really as fit to miſlead them, as they are willing to be miſled.

" THE *Druids* were held in ſuch Venera-
" tion by the People, that their Authority was
" almoſt abſolute. No publick Affairs were
" tranſacted without their Approbation; not
" ſo much as a Malefactor could be put to
" Death without their Conſent. Religion not
" only afforded them a Pretence to concern
" themſelves in the Government, but autho-
" rized them, as they pretended, to intermed-
" dle in private Affairs. Under colour that
" there is hardly any Caſe, but where Reli-
" gion may be concern'd, they claim'd a Power
" to exclude from the Sacrifices all ſuch as re-
" fus'd to ſubmit to their Determinations. By
" that means they became very formidable;
" this ſort of Excommunication being deem'd
" ſo infamous, that the Perſon on whom it was
" pronounced was avoided by all."

FOR this Account of the *Druids*, *Cæſar* and *Pliny* are cited. If this Author had been well adviſed, he would not have quoted at all, but have put down what he pleaſed from Memory, Invention, or Secret Hiſtory. At leaſt, he would not have uſed Names: But as ſome popular Haranguers, " So ſaith the Philoſo-
" pher, the Poet, or the Hiſtorian." To what Purpoſe doth a Man bring his Metal to the Touchſtone, when he knows it will not bear the Trial?

CÆSAR deſcribes the *Druids*, as the Prieſts and the Magiſtrates of the *Gauls*. After his Account

Account of their Sacrifices, and their preſiding in Affairs of Religion, he comes in the next Words to their being Judges in Civil Matters *. *Magnoque hi ſunt apud eos honore: Nam fere de omnibus Controverſiis publicis privatiſque conſtituunt: Et ſi quod eſt admiſſum facinus; ſi cædes facta; ſi de hæreditate; ſi de finibus controverſia eſt, iidem decernunt; præmia pœnaſque conſtituunt.* "These are highly honour'd, for "they determine almoſt all Controverſies pub-"lick and private. And if any Crime or Mur-"ther be committed; if there be a Diſpute "about Inheritance, or Extent of Lands, it "is decided by them: They decree Rewards "and Penalties."

It does not appear from *Cæſar*, that the ſame Perſons were at the Head of their religious and civil Affairs; only that they were *Druids*, as diſtinguiſh'd from *Equites*. The one Sort were inſtructed in the Cuſtoms and Rites of their Worſhip, and in their Municipal Laws; the other were Men of the Sword.

I will not enter into a Diſpute with Mr. *Rapin*, whether the ſame *Druids* acted as Prieſts and Lawyers; being inclin'd to believe the Offices were both executed by the ſame Perſon, becauſe it was the Practice of other Nations, particularly the *Roman*, whoſe Emperor was ſtiled *Pontifex Maximus*. But I deſire to know whence he gathers, that the *Druids* acting as Judges was an Uſurpation. Are they not ſet forth as the appointed Judges of the State? Are they not ſaid to be honourably eſteem'd? Is there one Syllable of their invading the Office? Of any one's grudging their Power, or

* *De Bello Gallico*, lib. 6.

that

that they aſſum'd any that did not belong to them? *Cæſar*'s Words imply their lawful Poſſeſſion of the Magiſtracy, as much as their Right to Sacrifice. As well might an Exception be made from the Hiſtory to Magiſtrates invading the Office of Sacrificers, as to Sacrificers taking upon them the Magiſtracy, neither of which is ſaid.

HAD the Age abounded with *Monkiſh* Writers, ſome of whoſe Accounts contradicted the other, ſome defective, ſome erroneous, here had been room for a Reformer of Hiſtory to have taken the worſt, and ſet aſide the beſt Authority. But when a Man produces a ſingle Evidence, and that very Evidence ſaith nothing to the Purpoſe, what are we to think of his Cauſe?

I CALL this a ſingle Evidence, becauſe *Pliny* is mute upon the Matter *. He writes of Trees in general, and at laſt comes to the *Viſcus Querci* or *Miſletoe*, *than which*, he ſaith, *the Druids hold nothing more ſacred.* When he has deſcribed the Solemnity of cutting it, and uſing it in their Sacrifices, he concludes with a Cenſure upon their Superſtition, but not a Word of their Roguery: *Tanta gentium in rebus frivolis plerunque Religio eſt*; "So much does "the Religion of theſe People conſiſt in "Trifles.

WE have, in the Notes upon *Rapin* ‡, a Project for employing Soldiers, in time of Peace, in Fortification. This I have no Objection to, but wiſh the Author had been ſo employed. Certainly Fortification is a cleanlier Employment than Demoliſhing. And whilſt

* *Plin.* Nat. Hiſt. lib. 16. cap. 44. ‡ Pag. 20.

he

he had kept to his proper Buſineſs, his Works might have paſs'd uncenſur'd. But when he takes upon himſelf the Part of a Comptroller in Hiſtory, and diſcharges his uſurped Office no better, every one that has a Regard to Truth and Decency, muſt wiſh to ſee him with his Half-pike in his Hand, overſeeing the Builders of Forts, ſuch as he deſcribes upon the *Picts* Wall. There might he have had his Name cut in Stone, or on a Rock, to perpetuate his Character of Diligence and Fidelity.

SOME Projectors might have propoſed writing Hiſtory as a fit Amuſement for a Soldier in his Leiſure: Being uſed to Diſcipline, they might have expected greater Decorum and Regularity in his Proceeding. But, alas, we have an Inſtance in this very Man, that he employs his Pen worſe than he would have been allowed to do his Sword. He exceeds the Licence even of War, cutting, ſlaſhing, maiming, ſtabbing, ripping up the beſt of our Countrymen, and making Ravages upon their Merit, in order to plant a Colony of Savage Notions deſtructive of the Peace and Security of Mankind.

WHAT a Return has he made for the hoſpitable Reception the exiled *Hugonots* found here? They were taken in by a Prince of the ſame Communion with him that expelled them. So much Humanity might have obtain'd at leaſt Silence upon his Misfortunes and Miſmanagements both. But this charitable, this humane Protector of the Diſtreſſed, meets with no better Quarter than to be abuſed and vilified. His Race, from their firſt aſcending the *Engliſh* Throne, are ſet out as Tyrants and Monſters, *by thoſe his former Bounty fed.* It is highly probable, that unfortunate Prince's Compaſſion

coſt

coſt him dear: That it was one of the Motives that raiſed the Pope's Choler againſt him. To depreciate the Kindneſs we have often heard it ſaid, his Deſign was to deliver them up to their own Monarch again to be tortured. Of this the Probability is equal to the Gratitude. If their King had that Intention, he would have kept them there.

A LEARNED Tract was written by one of theſe Gentlemen, who was preferr'd afterwards at *Salisbury*, for which a Dedication was drawn up and ſent to the Preſs, addreſſed to King *James* II. extolling his Princely Favour in receiving and protecting the *Refugees*. The Revolution came on before the Dedication was printed off: Then the Compliment was made to the Deliverer, who came to reſcue them from being given up to the Rage of their former Perſecutor.

ARE Royal Favours to be thus return'd? Is the Conſtitution to be ridiculed, miſrepreſented, undermined, by thoſe that have found an *Aſylum* here? What are we to think of ſuch Hiſtoriographers, diveſted of common Gratitude? Are theſe our Correctors and Inſtructors? Are theſe fit to convey the Characters of our Princes, who are by Principle Enemies to our Conſtitution? Are we to ſit down and admire the ſweet ſinging of Anarchy and Levelling? Shall we ſuffer Poſterity to be corrupted by their Doctrines, without letting them know from what Hands they come?

UPON ſetting aſide *Maud* the Empreſs, Mr. *Rapin* thus entertains his Readers. * "If the "Nobility had that Attachment for Religion,

* Page 201.

which

" which they affected to ſhew, their repeated " Oaths to *Matilda* would have been an inſu- " perable Obſtacle to *Stephen*'s Election. But " they were then as well skill'd as now, in the " Art of evading the moſt ſolemn Oaths, by " Diſtinctions and mental Reſervations, which " render the Uſe of an Oath of no Effect."

WHO would have thought of ſuch a home Stroke from *Holland?*

IN the Advertiſement of *Acta Regia*, we find Mr. *Rapin Thoyras* is employed to write by *the Lords the States General.* It is a great Liberty which they have given him, or a great Liberty which he has taken.

AS if an abſurd Notion cannot be introduc'd but by a Maſter of the Ceremonies, we have him again * comparing the *Saxon* Heptarchy to the preſent Government of the Seven Provinces. The Number *Seven*, once a Number of Perfection, was, I preſume, a fortunate Hint to him to expatiate, when he labour'd under a Dearth of Materials for his Hiſtory. " In *Britain*, each King was Sovereign in his " own Dominions: But notwithſtanding this, " all the Kingdoms together were in ſome re- " ſpects conſider'd as the ſame State; and " every one ſubmitted to the General Aſſem- " bly of the Seven Kingdoms, to which he " gave his Conſent, by himſelf or Repreſenta- " tive. And therefore this Form of Govern- " ment may be very juſtly compared to that of " the *United Provinces*, each of which is Sove- " reign and Independent, though they ſubmit " to the Determination of the *States-General.*"

* Page 42 and 46.

His View here may be to compliment the *States* with a Pattern of Government whence theirs was taken. But chiefly, we may preſume, to trace the *Original Contract*. Whether we are directed to fix the Appearance of that *Chimæra* in this Age as to *Britain*, or to look upon it as then recover'd, I do not determine. But I may ſay, it would have been a Piece of good Manners to have told his Readers where this Point of Hiſtory is to be found. Might he not as well have call'd it the *Conſtitution* under the *Britiſh Reguli*, becauſe they pitched upon *Caſſibelan* to head them againſt *Cæſar*? Or might not the ſame be aſſerted as to *Scotland*, becauſe *Aidan* King of *Scots* aſſiſted the *Britons* againſt the *Saxons*, to prevent their ſubduing his Country? At leaſt an Union of the two Kingdoms might have been obſerved, and that Union in our Days imitated.

The Uſe of this ſeems to be, preparing the Reader to take Things upon Truſt. We ſhall ſee what Superſtructure he will raiſe upon ſuch a Foundation. Where Proof is ready made to his Hands, he is generous enough to produce it.

——Themſelves will ſometimes be,
Of Gifts that coſt them nothing, free. *

But when Proof muſt be labour'd, and after great Labour ſubmit to a Confutation, the Story is turn'd out naked to beg its Way, preſuming upon the Eaſineſs of an Age uſed to Cheat and Impoſture.

* *Hudibras*, Name-ſake to a *Britiſh* Monarch omitted in this Hiſtory.

WHAT learned Arguings have we in this Author about the *Engliſh* Conſtitution? His *Pro* and his *Con* are formally laid down, though he has beforehand determin'd the Cauſe. Is nothing to be ſupported but what he can find a Parallel for in Hiſtory? What if Parliaments cannot be proved *Antediluvian?* What if neither the *Germans* of *Tacitus*, nor the *Chineſe*, afford any Traces of them? Are not the Liberties of the People ſettled upon as ſure a Foundation from the Conceſſions of our Princes? Are they not indeed upon a ſurer Foundation than *Original* Contract; ſince theſe Conceſſions are to be ſeen, and the *Original Contract* not to be ſeen?

WHY are ſo great Pains taken to ſhew that the People had their Repreſentatives in the great Council of the *Anglo-Saxons* before there were any of the leſſer *Freeholds?* Whence came the Notion, that the Commons voted for a Property they were not poſſeſs'd of; and that they ſat down with the Lords, to whom they were Vaſſals? Unleſs to render thoſe Monarchs odious, by whoſe Grants their Liberties were aſſured? And to make Monarchy odious, even after thoſe Limitations it has ſet to itſelf? Were the *Saxon* Kings reſtrain'd from acting by their great Council, or any other Council? It was their Intereſt and their Prudence, to convene their Barons upon every material Occaſion. What was meant by their Conſent, 'tis eaſy to judge from the following Grant of *Egfrid* during the Heptarchy. We have it in *Mat. Paris*, *Anno* 796.

Ego Egfridus *gratiâ Dei Rex* Merciorum, *Anno Dominicæ Incarnationis Septingenteſimo nonageſimo*

nageſimo ſexto, Indictione quarta, primo vero anno Regni noſtri Terram + *Manentium nomine* Thyrefeld *cum Terminis ſuis Domino meo* Jeſu Chriſto, *et ejus pretioſo Martyri* Albano *liberaliter, aeternaliter cum Conſenſu ac Teſtimonio Optimatum meorum in jus Monaſteriale pro Animâ meâ et Parentum meorum devotiſſime tribuo et libenter concedo. Sitque prædicta Terra ab omni terrenæ ſervitutis jugo ſemper aliena; atque eadem libertate ſit libera quâ cæteræ Terræ Monaſterii beati* Albani *conſcriptæ atque conceſſæ ſunt a glorioſo* Offâ *genitore meo.*

+ *Ego* Eagfridus *Rex hanc meam donationem cum ſigno crucis confirmare curabo.*
+ *Ego* Cynedrid, *Regina, conſenſi.*
+ *Ego* Unwona, *Epiſcopus.*
+ *Ego* Weothanus, *Epiſcopus.*
+ *Ego* Beonna, *Abbas.*
+ *Ego* Elphun, *Epiſcopus.*
+ *Ego* Beorda, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Wigbertus, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Wiega, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Aſhmudus, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Cuthbertus, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Ethelhardus, *Archiepiſcopus, conſenſi.*
+ *Ego* Eobing, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Forthred, *Abbas.*
+ *Ego* Sighere, *filius* Sighere.
+ *Ego* Eſne, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Cydda, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Winbertus, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Heardbertus, *Dux.*
+ *Ego* Beorda, *Dux.*

THIS the *Rapiners* would call an Act of Parliament for the Kingdom of *Mercia*. Let it be of a *Wittenagemot* or Council, for ſuch it appears.

pears. The Conſent here expreſs'd, does not comprehend a Power of Refuſal. Might not the King give away his own Land without Leave of his Queen, *&c.*? By Conſent, can be meant no more than quitting Claim, by which the Owner ſhall be ſecured from any Moleſtation. *Conſenſus* here is almoſt comprehended in *Teſtimonium*. For he that ſigns a Deed as Witneſs, ſeems to give up Claim. Conſent being inſerted, ſhews he had conſider'd the Thing; and though he might be ſurprized into his Teſtimony, he could not into his Conſent.

HAPPY has it been for the Subjects of this Land, that their Monarchs have ſo ſtrictly bound themſelves againſt invading their Liberties. But what Thanks to the *Original Contractors* for that? They would make Liberty precarious enough, founding it in Dreams and Forgery. If it be not for want of Honeſty, it is at leaſt for want of Wit, that the Title-Deed to an Eſtate ſhould be inſiſted on, which is no where to be found. If theſe are to be eſteem'd Patriots and Guardians of the Peoples Liberty, it is like to be well defended!

SUPPOSING *Magna-Charta* did revive the Liberty enjoyed by the Subjects of the *Saxon* Kings, it is but juſt upon the ſame Footing it would be if King *John* and *Henry* III. gave it Being. It was a Purchaſe of the Subjects, and they paid dear for it, before they had Livery and Seiſin, though theſe two Monarchs had aſſured it to them. It is not to be doubted but ſuch humane and pious Princes as *Alfred*, treated their Subjects rather as Children than as Slaves. But all this was effaced in the barbarous *Norman* Conqueſt, when Laws were razed,

and

and the Land new planted with foreign Lords, to whom the vanquiſh'd *Engliſh* were but as Cattle and Stock upon their Ground.

THERE is a Shew, indeed, of *William*'s confirming the Laws of *Edward* the Confeſſor, when he ſwore, before the Abbot of St. *Alban*'s, and other *Optimates*, to obſerve them. This he perform'd as much as at firſt he intended. His Oath was obliterated by his Luſt of Power. He was at that time ſtrong enough to have carried all before him, though he ſubmitted to the Formality of Swearing; well knowing the People were not in a Condition to make him keep his Oath. Having upon ſome Occaſions trump'd up a Title from the Confeſſor's pretended Will, he the more eaſily came into Engagements to follow his Steps. He had Titles for every Body. Upon ſome Stomachs Conqueſt ſat eaſy enough, upon others *Edward*'s Deſignation. It's plain, he inſiſted little upon the latter, whatever he had at one Time given out; well knowing what he got was neither the Confeſſor's to give, nor even to keep. It would have been a high Strain of Power for a *Saxon* King to transfer his Subjects Allegiance to a Foreigner; and higher ſtill to transfer that which he held by no better Claim than keeping out the right Heir. He had ſweetned the People into Submiſſion to him, by taking off the Tax called *Danegelt*.

IT is much we have not heard yet of a Repreſentative of the *Commons*, to be found in the endowing Grant of *Egfrid* juſt recited. That ſame *Sighere Fitz-Sighere*, ſounds very like the Name of a *Commoner*. I will truſt this Hint in their Hands: Whatever Weapons they have, there's

there's no Danger but of cutting their own Fingers.

RAPIN, when he comes to his Reflections on the primitive State of the *Engliſh* Church, has, * to uſe the *Cibberian* Phraſe, *Outdone his own Outdoings*. He has ſet forth *Auguſtine* and his Labours to great Diſadvantage: He ſhews an Inclination to have Matters of Fact denied or extenuated: And, if one may gueſs by his repreſenting Things, he would, if a *Pagan-Saxon*, rather have lain in the Dirt, than have been helped out by a Hand he had ſo great Averſion to ſpeak well of. Why is he ſo full of the Corruptions brought in with *Auguſtine*? And what were thoſe Corruptions? It appears the Form of Church-Government was the ſame which the *Britons* and afterwards the *Scots* maintain'd. That the moſt material Difference was about the Time of keeping *Eaſter*, and ſubmitting to the Pope's Authority. If any Thing elſe had ſtood in the Way, we ſhould not have ſeen the *Italian* Miſſionaries ſolliciting the *Britons* and *Scots* to aſſiſt in converting the *Saxons*. Nor would the *Britons* and *Scots* in their Anſwers have been ſilent upon the Head of Novelty and Corruption.

Too great an Encouragement of Monaſtick Retirement may, indeed, be reckon'd amongſt the Corruptions of thoſe early Ages: As theſe Orders were founded in Fanaticiſm; as thoſe Bodies were protected in a Rebellion to their local and proper Biſhops; as they were endow'd with the Spoils of the Parochial Altars, the Inſtitution was indeed to the Diſadvantage of Religion; though Men of the moſt exalted

* Page 80.

Piety

Piety and Virtue had choſen this Life, to avoid the Vices and the Vanity of the World; yet even the *Britons* and *Scots* had the ſame high Notions of this Retirement. They had ſucked in an Eſteem of what they called a Regular Life, in Oppoſition to that of the Clergy, whom they, by way of leſſening, deem'd Secular; not aware of the Conſequences of this appearing Piety, which has involv'd Chriſtendom in Blood and Deſolation, and, by ſerving politick Purpoſes, produced very ill Effects.

* "IN the Beginning of Chriſtianity, and "even for the firſt three hundred Years, the "Converts generally conſiſted of People of the "loweſt Rank, and we hear of nothing but "Perſecution and Death from the Princes and "Magiſtrates. Whereas in *England*, the Kings "were the firſt that embrac'd the Faith, and, "by their Authority and Example, induc'd "their Subjects to do the ſame.—— What is "the Reaſon the Devil leſs vigorouſly ob-"ſtructed the Converſion of the *Engliſh*, than "that of ſo many other Nations, during the "Life and after the Death of the Apoſtles? "Theſe Things afford Matter for many Re-"flections, which I ſhall not here enter into, "but leave to the Conſideration of the Rea-"der. I ſhall only remark, that the Eaſe "wherewith the Converſion of the *Engliſh* was "brought about, extreamly weakens the Force "of the Argument drawn in favour of the "Chriſtian Religion from the Perſecution of "the *Roman* Emperors."

WHAT would this Hiſtorian be at? Is he diſputing the Truth of that Hiſtory which

* Page 80.

aſſures

aſſures us the firſt Converſions were againſt the ſtrongeſt Oppoſition of Power and Learning? If Chriſtianity, upon a ſecond planting in *Britain*, found an eaſier Paſſage than at its firſt planting in the Eaſt, muſt we conclude the Accounts of that planting in the Eaſt are falſe?

WHAT a Help to Diſcourſe is this Writer? Some Points we may learn are beſt eſtabliſh'd by ſubduing Oppoſition, and beſt again for *falling before it.* Whither is he leading his twenty thouſand Admirers? Are they to take for granted, their *Saxon* Anceſtors were not converted to Chriſtianity, becauſe they were not Martyrs? What if the firſt Proſelytes were of the meaner Sort? Thence could be the leaſt Suſpicion of Influence or Authority, therefore the greater Appearance of Conviction and Reality. Were there not alſo ſome Men of Figure, as *Cornelius* the *Centurion*, and the *African* Eunuch? Of courſe, in a Multitude, the meaner Sort are by far the moſt. May not the Example of *Cornelius* and the *Eunuch* have gone as far to propagate the Faith as that of meaner Men? Could not Chriſtianity have been planted without the Blood of Martyrs, by Evidence of Miracles? Probably the new Converts would have fallen off upon the Approach of Perſecution: And therefore they were initiated in Sufferings, that they might ſee the worſt at firſt; that they might not be reproached with liſting in a Profeſſion which they ſhould diſparage by Deſertion.

SUCH Notions as theſe would exclude Providence from the different Methods of proving Mens Obedience. Are there no Virtues to be exerciſed in Proſperity? No room for Temptations to Luxury and Exceſs?

" WHAT is the Reaſon the Devil leſs vi-
" gorouſly obſtructed the Converſion of the
" *Engliſh?* "

WHO taught him that the Devil has an unlimited Power? Or that the abſence of Perſecution diſarms him of his Power? Is not Proſperity the Seaſon of Pride and Infidelity?

THIS Author ſeems but little acquainted with the Devil's Power, or but little jealous of it. Do not all Hiſtories abound with Inſtances of Religion loſing its Force in a Calm? How many learned Men has the Devil excited to promote Hereſy and Schiſm, pleas'd to ſhew their Talents, and be reckon'd by After-Ages Leaders of a Sect, and Authors of Diſcoveries? How many has he puſh'd on, by the Proſpect of State and Riches, to drop the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity, leaving barely its Name; to indulge Princes in indecent Liberties, and to argue away their Obligations to Religious Duties, depriving the Subjects of their pious Influence and Example?

WITH as much Reaſon, if not more, may it be ſaid, the Devil's Hands were tied up, when Sufferings produc'd Regularity of Life; when there were no Baits of Luxury and Grandeur to lead Men into Indifference, Supineneſs, or Exceſs.

" THESE Things afford Matter for many
" Reflections, which I ſhall not here enter in-
" to, but leave to the Conſideration of the
" Reader. "

HAD he ſpoke out, what could he have ſaid, but that the Religion planted by *Auguſtine* would not hurt the Devil's Kingdom, and therefore he was not concern'd to obſtruct it? This is what he leaves to his Reader's Conſideration.

LET

LET him not ſay, *Qui capit ille facit.* If the Words will bear any other Conſtruction, let him produce it, to deliver himſelf from the Charge of attributing the Works of God to the Devil.

HE quotes a Paragraph from *Penſus de Paſch*, I ſuppoſe *Paſchal*, juſt and unexceptionable; * "Let a Man conſider the Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity; that a Religion ſo contrary to *Nature*, ſhould make its Way in the World by ſuch mild and gentle Means, without any Violence or Conſtraint, and yet ſhould be ſo firmly rooted withal, that it was not in the Power of the moſt barbarous Torments to compel the Martyrs to renounce their Faith; and that all this ſhould be done, not only without the Aſſiſtance of any Prince, but in direct Oppoſition to all the Kings of the Earth, *&c.*" This is copied, becauſe he can ſo eaſily anſwer it, *Stans pede in uno:* "It is eaſy to ſee this Argument loſes much of its Strength, when applied to the Converſion of the *Engliſh.*"

WAS this Argument ever brought to prove Chriſtianity could not be introduced but by Martyrdom? And to what Purpoſe is it brought now, but to prove it was never introduc'd amongſt the *Saxons* at all? If nothing but Suffering can plant a Religion, 'tis plain the *Saxons* never had any.

WERE this Point granted to Mr. *Rapin*, what Uſe would he make of it? After giving a particular Account of the firſt Steps, and of the Progreſs of Chriſtianity amongſt the *Saxons* in *Britain*, he is pleas'd, in a ludicrous Manner,

* Page 80.

to insinuate to us, Christianity was not there at all.

The Note upon the preceding Observation of *Paschal*, is this: * "This, by the By, supposes the Christian Religion in its primitive "State to be clogg'd with all those Absurdities it now labours under, particularly amongst "the *Romanists*. For surely nothing worse can "be said of Reveal'd Religion, than that it is "contrary to *Nature*, Sense, or Reason." This Note is upon the Word *Nature* in *Paschal*.

I do not apprehend Religion clogg'd with any Absurdity because Mr. *Paschal* has described it, *Contrary to Nature*.

If Religion exposes a Man to Sufferings, when he shall be called to them, and Nature shrinks at those Sufferings, Religion appoints what Nature is averse to: And what Nature is averse to, is contrary to Nature. Is there not a just Distinction between Nature rude and unassisted, and Nature fortified and improved? The Law of Nature teaches a Man to avoid Pain and Danger, yet Principles deduced from the Law of Nature teach him to expose himself to Pain and Danger in Defence of his Father or his Prince. Gratitude is deducible from the Law of Nature, yet 'tis Natural to fly from some Proofs of it.

Farther; "The Ecclesiastical History "speaks of several Saints in different Parts of "the World; but withal tells us, that scarce "one of them escaped being terribly persecuted, or even losing his Life in the Cause "of Truth.

* Page 80.

If

If the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory ſpeaks of thoſe only who had the Crown of Martyrdom, why ſhould we expect it ſhould mention all the reſt who were not called to lay down their Life; nay, who were by Cenſures prohibited from offering themſelves to their Perſecutors; any more than we ſhould expect from the Weekly Bills a Liſt of all that are alive at *London*?

I am not here perſuading the *Rapiners* to embrace any Religion; my Endeavour is to convince their Readers, that they are not honeſtly treated by ſuch a Conveyance of Facts as they give us under the Name of a Hiſtory. Some Errors I now paſs by, becauſe I do not find them voluntary.

He muſt go on with his Cuckoe's Tone upon the Original of Liberty.

* He gives us a Tranſlation of *Edward* the Second's Coronation Oath. It begins, "Sire, "Will you keep and confirm by your Oath to "the People of *England* the Laws eſtabliſhed "by the pious Kings your Predeceſſors, and "particularly the Laws, Cuſtoms, and Liber-"ties, granted to the Clergy and People by "the glorious St. *Edward* your Predeceſſor?"

Upon this Queſtion his Remark is; "As "this is the firſt perfect Copy of a Coronation "Oath to be met with in the *Engliſh* Hiſtory, "it will not be foreign to the Purpoſe, to take "Notice of the Advantage gain'd by the Peo-"ple upon the Royal Prerogatives, ſince the "Eſtabliſhment of *Magna-Charta*. It mani-"feſtly appears by this Oath, that, far from "ſuppoſing the Great Charter to be the origi-"nal Title of the Privileges granted by King

* Page 389.

"*John*

" *John* to the People of *England*, it was con-
" ſider'd only as a Confirmation of the antient
" Liberties of the Nation. Upon this Suppo-
" ſition *Edward* II. was made to ſwear, he
" would obſerve the Laws of St. *Edward*, which
" were no other than thoſe of the *Anglo-*
" *Saxons*; leſt by cauſing him to ſwear to
" keep the Great Charter, there might be
" Room to imagine the Privileges of the Peo-
" ple were founded on the Conceſſions of the
" Kings. "

WITHOUT repeating what has been already ſaid upon this Point, I muſt obſerve, Mr. *Rapin* will give us what is *to the Purpoſe*. His General *Purpoſe*, he means, of denying Kings any Opportunity of doing Good to their People. I do not ſee to what other *Purpoſe* he can make this wiſe Remark: " Leſt by cauſing him to
" ſwear to keep the Great Charter, there might
" be Room to imagine the Privileges of the
" People were founded on the Conceſſions of
" the Kings. "

IS there not Room to imagine it ſtill, when the Words of the Oath produc'd by himſelf expreſs as much? " Laws, Cuſtoms, Liberties,
" *granted* to the Clergy and People by the glo-
" rious St. *Edward*. " Is not a Grant a Gift or a Conceſſion? If he pleaſe to go higher, to the other pious Kings Predeceſſors, will he find any Foundation for the Thing but Conceſſion?

WERE I of Council for the *Original Contractors*, I ſhould think the beſt Plea they have is the Contract with *John*, *Henry* III. and their Succeſſor. They paid their Money to be put in Poſſeſſion of thoſe Liberties they could make out no other Title to but the good Treatment

ment the *Saxon* Kings had ſhewn to their Subjects.

"THE Advantages gain'd by the People "upon the Royal Prerogatives?" If they were gain'd from the Prerogative, they belonged to the Prerogative; at leaſt they had been poſſeſs'd by the Prerogative ever ſince the Conqueſt: And the Conqueſt obliterated all Privileges but what were the Will of the Conqueror, and of the *Norman* Lords amongſt whom he had divided the Poſſeſſions and Privileges of the *Engliſh*. They had gain'd ſo much by their Arms upon King *John*, that they might have gain'd his Crown too, if they had pleaſed, and have call'd it a Privilege of the *Anglo-Saxons*.

THE laſt Clauſe of *Edward*'s Coronation Oath is alſo tranſlated for *the good old Purpoſe*. "SIRE, Will you promiſe to keep and cauſe "to be kept, the Laws and Statutes that the "Community of your Kingdom ſhall judge fit "to enact, and will you defend and protect "them to the utmoſt of your Power?"

ACCORDING to the Words, he has put the enacting Power in the Parliament, whereas the Form was, and has long ſince been, to petition the King to enact ſuch or ſuch Law. He might have ſaid, *fit to be enacted*, then had he left the Power of enacting where it reſided. The Original is, *Sire, grante vous a tenir et garder les Loys et les Cuſtumes droitureles les quiels la Communante de votre Royaume aura eſleu.* The *Engliſh* of *aura eſleu*, muſt be, *ſhall chuſe*, or ſhall have made choice of, to lay before you.

EDWARD

EDWARD I. had ſeverely treated the Clergy of his Time, for refuſing a Tax impos'd upon them, on which we have this ſmart Remark *, *Thus the Clergy, when they meet with vigorous Princes, are as ſubmiſſive, as they are haughty, when they have to deal with thoſe that are ſcrupulous and weak.*

It would have been kind in *Rapin* to have made ſome Diſtinction in his Charges, if he would have let us know what he means by the Clergy. Sometimes the Pope and his Myrmidons are call'd the Clergy, ſometimes the Monks, and ſometimes the Biſhops and Parochial Prieſts who paſs under the Denomination of Seculars. Theſe are all in their Turns heavily loaded. They are doom'd to bear one another's Faults, and whatever one of the three do amiſs, is always fix'd upon the other two. Sometimes, indeed, the Seculars come in for a Share of Blame, where they are impos'd upon and Fellow-Sufferers with the Laity. Thus κλῆρος may be interpreted *Choſen*, for Contempt and Ridicule. It would become an Hiſtorian of Mr. *Rapin*'s Candour and Ingenuity, who ſearches ſo deeply into the Springs of Action, to inform his Reader, how the Sufferers by Pride and Avarice are made Partners in the Crime with thoſe who oppreſs them. Is it enough to ſay, ſuch or ſuch a Practice may be charg'd upon the White-men, the Copper-colour'd, or the Negroes, becauſe ſome of their Species are juſtly accus'd of it? Would he ſay, the Laity murther Princes, becauſe *Richard* III. did it? Was it a Doctrine of the

* Page 378.

Church,

Church, that *Edward* the Third's Children were illegitimate, and thoſe of *Clarence* incapable to inherit, becauſe Dr. *Shaw* affirm'd it from St. *Paul's* Croſs? Of what Uſe is Hiſtory, if it lets us into no more, indeed, if it lets us into ſo much, that whatever exorbitant Demands were made here by the *Pope* and his *Italians*, the poor Seculars, equal Sufferers with the Laity at all Times, and generally much greater, muſt bear the Scandal of?

THIS Author does not conceal, that the Pope ſent a Bull for levying the Tenths of the Clergy for three Years, of which *Edward* I. had a Snack for permitting it. He owns that the Pope abſolv'd him from his Oath to obſerve *Magna Charta* and the *Foreſt Charter*, that he might with a better Grace ſpunge the Laity, whilſt himſelf pluck'd the Clergy; yet in the Life of this very Prince does he reflect upon their Submiſſiveneſs and their Haughtineſs.

THIS Notion of Haughtineſs he had, perhaps, juſtly taken up of the Pope, from the laſt-mention'd Inſtance, and from ſeveral others: And there is nothing more flagrant in Hiſtory. But by what Rule of Juſtice this Act of the Oppreſſor is chargeable upon the Oppreſſed, 'tis hard for any but himſelf to ſee. He need not go far for the Pope's Submiſſiveneſs, after King *John* of *France* was brought Priſoner hither by the Black Prince. The disbanded Soldiers getting together, over-ran the Country. A Party of them under Sir *Arnold Cervoles*, a *Gaſcon* Knight, after plundering great Part of *France*, came to *Avignon*, where the Pope reſided, and made him pay, by Way of Con-

tribution, ſixty thouſand Crowns. He farther made his Holineſs give him Abſolution for all the Deſtruction he had made. This was indeed ſubmiſſive enough, to proſtitute his moſt ſacred Truſt for the Security of his Skin.

THE Companions, as they were called, being a Crew of the ſame Sort, in the Year 1361, had ſurely the ſame Deſign to expoſe his Holineſs; who, after they had got his Money at *Avignon*, extorted from him a Pardon *ab omni pœnâ & culpâ*.

THESE Proofs of the Submiſſiveneſs of a Clergyman, let Mr. *Rapin* glory in; but let him not apply it to all the reſt by a Plenitude of Power, reſembling the Papal, aſſum'd to himſelf above all other Hiſtorians. It may be allow'd him, that they are all at ſome Times ſubmiſſive, when they cannot help it. And are not the Laity ſo too? Did not the ſame *Edward* draw their Purſe-ſtrings as often as he pleas'd. Have not the Popes, upon whom the Clergy depended, frequently forbid them to raiſe Money? And have not the ſame Popes taken Part againſt them at other Times, and for their own Profit humour'd their Princes in ſpunging them? They were between *the upper and the nether Mill-ſtone*. If they oppos'd the Pope's uſurp'd Authority, he could raiſe the Civil Arm againſt them. If they ſubmitted to it, they had as often the State to correct them for Obedience.

BUT this Mr. *Rapin* ſeems to be reading Lectures to Princes, to inſtruct them to be vigorous. And what does he mean by Vigour in *Edward* I.? The Pope had, or the King drain'd them dry, and it was Vigour to load them

them afreſh! When it was a Part of the Conſtitution for the Clergy to tax themſelves, did they not keep pace with, if not out-ſtretch the Laity? Have not ſome in inferior Preferments rejoic'd at the Eaſe they found in being ſeſſed by Parliament?

The Epithets *Scrupulous* and *Weak*, are prettily oppoſed to *Vigorous! Edward* was *vigorous* in plundering the Clergy, elſe he had been *ſcrupulous and weak!* To ſcruple what is not fit to be done, has been accounted a Virtue; now 'tis but equivalent to Weakneſs! If all Scruples are to be laughed out of the World, ſuch as are oppoſite to Vigour in Oppreſſion, we have an uſeful Monitor every *Saturday*. By the ſame *Recipe* may every great Man get the better of his Scruples, and reduce his little Neighbours to beggary: So ſhall he preſerve his Title to a good Underſtanding. Theſe vigorous Hiſtorians are better ſuited to the Meridian of *Angria* or *Madagaſcar*. The great Uſe of Hiſtory has been to improve, not to deſtroy Mens Morals. If Reflection upon Facts is juſtifiable at all, it is to ſhew the ill Succeſs that frequently purſues ill Deſigns, and the Security of a juſt and upright Behaviour. There is enough, generally, in Nature, diſpoſing Men to follow their Appetite; they need no Leſſons to corrupt them. Shall we ſay Mr. *Rapin* has this End in View? Shall we ſay he promotes it inadvertently? Or that he knows the Palate of his Readers, and ſooths them in Opinions they would be glad to ſee confirm'd? Or ſhall we ſuppoſe more Heads than one collecting his Materials, interlarding them with ſuch Miſrepreſentations as they have found their Account in propagating?

OUR Author ſhews none of that great Knowledge of the *Engliſh* Conſtitution which he is pleas'd to aſſume, when he relates the Proſecution of *Wickliff* *: Or he ſhews want of Judgment in his Choice of Authors. He ſays, "After he had taken his Place according to his "Rank, and been interrogated by the Biſhop "of *London*, he would have anſwer'd ſitting, "and thereby gave Occaſion for a great Diſ-"pute. The Biſhop inſiſted upon his ſtanding "and being uncover'd; and the Duke of *Lan-"caſter* pretended, *Wickliff* was there only as "a Doctor to give his Vote and Opinion, and "not as a Party accus'd."

I AM not arraigning *Wickliff*, or excuſing his Judges. But why may we not have *Veriſimilitude* at leaſt? Hath an accuſed Perſon any *Place* and *Rank* before his Judges? I do not find the Duke of *Lancaſter* or the Earl *Marſhal* had either Place or Rank there. If they ſeated themſelves upon the Biſhop's Bench, they were but Intruders, and could not juſtify it, without Permiſſion of the Biſhops in their proper Court. A Nobleman is often complimented with ſuch a Seat, upon Suppoſition he comes to appear as a Witneſs upon the Trial; or, as a Spectator, he may be allow'd it: For Courts are publick, that the Juſtice of their Proceedings may appear. But how could the Duke ſay, *Wickliff* came thither to give his Vote and Opinion, and not as a Party accus'd? The Court is ſaid to have ſat on no other Occaſion than *Wickliff*'s being accus'd. And what elſe brought the Duke there? Will Mr. *Rapin* ſay, the Lay Lords ſat at St. *Paul*'s in Judgment with the

* Page 444.

Spiritual?

Spiritual? The Truth of this is not at the Bottom of a Well, but eaſily drawn up: That theſe Lords appearing with the Perſon accus'd, thought to intimidate his Judges. And conſidering how far *Wickliff*'s Doctrines had prevail'd, and how well they were founded, when they came to be look'd into, they might hope, through the great Power and Intereſt they had, to give a Turn to the Proſecution, and leave the Pope to thunder from *Rome*, unable to find Inſtruments to ſupport a Claim when it ſhould be in Diſgrace with the Nation. They knew of what Service it is to have a Cauſe countenanc'd: That the Doctor would aſſert his Tenets with the better Courage, when he found he was not deſerted. That as Eſtates are got by the Poor, ſo is Power; and the *Turba Remi* falling in with the diſtreſs'd Side, has frequently chang'd the Face of Things. Theſe Lords had the better Foundation for their Hopes, from the King's having appear'd ſo ſtrenuous againſt the Temporal Encroachments of the Pope, in his Statutes of *Premuire* and *Proviſors*.

THIS is the beſt Reaſon *Rapin* can give for calling *Edward* III. *a good Chriſtian* *. "There "are few Princes to be met with in Hiſtory, "in whom were ſo well mix'd the Duties of a "Sovereign, with thoſe of an honeſt Man, and "a good Chriſtian." If ravaging Countries, and burning all the Towns that he came at, even when he had no Proſpect of reducing them to his own Poſſeſſion; if beggaring his Subjects to maintain the Sport of War and Luſt of Grandeur, entitles him to a Pre-eminence in Religion; this Author is fit to write Hiſtory.

* Page 445.

When

When he comes at a Prince deſerving the Character, even without his ſaving Clauſe, " his " Conduct was not altogether blameleſs," how does he or his Factors load Innocence with Crimes, and tranſmute Piety into Vice?

I NEED not make an Apology for the Freedom I take with Mr. *Rapin*, if I produce a Compariſon of his between *Richard* II. and a King *in our Days* *. " It may be farther ob- " ſerv'd, that the violent Method practis'd by " *Richard* to attain to Arbitrary Power, I mean " forc'd Elections, and the Opinions of the " Judges, was exactly copied in our Days by " one of his Succeſſors, who had without " Doubt the ſame Intention. But we may " add, that the Attempts of theſe two Mo- " narchs ſerv'd only to promote their own " Deſtruction, and that their Deſigns came to " the ſame Cataſtrophe." † " Pretences were " no longer ſought to demand Subſidies; the " Miniſter's whole Buſineſs was only to find " ſpeedy and effectual Means to extort Money " from the People, to whom the demanding it " was thought to be too great an Honour. At " length, having practic'd divers Expedients, " as unjuſt as extraordinary, to ſupply the " King's prodigious Expences, and ſatisfy his " Miniſters Avarice, a Method was us'd which " could not fail of procuring large Sums. As " the late Parliament had revers'd the Pardon " granted in 1386, to the Duke of *Glouceſter*'s " Adherents, Accuſations were brought againſt " ſuch as had then taken Arms in Favour of " that Prince. By the Judgments given upon

* Page 469. † Page 470.

" theſe

" theſe Accuſations, ſeventeen Counties were " condemn'd as guilty of Treaſon, and the " Eſtates of all the Inhabitants adjudg'd to the " King. In this Extremity, the richer Sort of " Gentlemen and Burgeſſes were forc'd, in " order to avoid the Seizure of their Eſtates, " to give blank Obligations, which the King " caus'd to be fill'd up with what Sums he was " pleas'd to exact. Moreover, by what was " inſerted in theſe Notes, which were term'd " *Ragmans*, every Perſon was bound, un- " der great Penalties, to ſupport the Statutes " of the *Shrewsbury* Parliament, and all the " ſubſequent Acts; that is to ſay, they en- " tirely threw themſelves upon the King's " Mercy.

" IT was impoſſible that a Government ſo " Tyrannical ſhould not draw the Hatred of " the Nation upon the Prince and his Inſtru- " ments. It was alſo very viſible, that theſe " Oppreſſions kindled in the Hearts of the " People an ardent Deſire of freeing themſelves " from them, inſomuch that the leaſt Spark " was capable of producing a fatal Combuſ- " tion. "

I CANNOT gueſs which of our Princes he means in this Compariſon, ſo notoriouſly unjuſt is it to ſay it of any of them. It is not hard to gueſs who of them are moſt diſagreeable in Mr. *Rapin*'s Eyes. In what Latitude he will interpret, *Our Days*, I do not know. If he had his Inſtructions from the Writer of *Ludlow*'s Memoirs, or ſuch another, he might be old enough to take in a Prince elder than Mr. *Rapin* could be Cotemporary with. And, perhaps, he has here betrayed his Correſpondence for want of altering the Expreſſion. If I

am to gueſs whom he means, I muſt be determin'd by his Antipathy to Virtue in Kings; the better the Prince was, the more likely to be made odious by an ill-deſigning Hiſtorian.

WHERE will he find an exact Copy for this? * "The Parliament ſtrove to carry the "Prerogative Royal to a greater Height than "any King of *England* had ever pretended to "ſtretch it; and eſtabliſh'd ſuch Maxims as "were deſtructive of the Conſtitution, and the "Liberties of the People. They approv'd, as "conformable to Law, the Opinions for which "nine Years before the Judges were condemn'd. "Purſuant to this Principle, the Judges who "attended during the ſitting of the Parliament, "decided, that, When the King propos'd any "Articles to be debated in Parliament, it was "High-Treaſon to bring in others before the "King's were firſt diſpatch'd. By this and "the like Deciſions, the Caſes of High-Treaſon were ſo multiplied, that hardly was it "poſſible to prevent falling into that Crime, "unleſs by making the King's Will and Pleaſure the ſole Rule of Action. At laſt, under "Colour of diſpatching Buſineſs, the Parliament appointed a certain Number of Commiſſioners, who were inveſted with the Authority of the whole Houſe. Thus, by an "unprecedented Act, the whole Power of the "Nation was devolv'd to the King, twelve "Peers, and ſix Commoners."

WHEN ſuch Patriots as *Rapin* make the Crown Elective, they uſe to fetch their Arguments from Practice; expounding the Word *elegerunt* to their Purpoſe, which they frequently

* Page 469.

meet

meet with in the Monkiſh Hiſtorians, to expreſs the Recognition of a Sovereign againſt all Competitors. Yet the moſt he makes of this Choice is, that the People choſe, and the Kings would not be choſen. It is ſtrange that the People inveſted with this great Power of making their Maſters, ſhould never have inſiſted upon this Condition with a new Maſter, that he ſhould own his Title from them. A Precedent would have been worth its Weight in Gold. He brings in *Henry* IV. * accepting their Preſent, and ſpurning at the Givers; as much as to ſay, "Gentlemen, I thank you for the Crown, but "it was mine before." Here the Original Contract was certainly defective, that there was no Proviſion made to bind up their Princes to acknowledge the Source of their Authority. "By this Means, ſaith he, he excluded the "only lawful Title he had, namely, the General Conſent of the People, in order to build "his Claim upon three manifeſtly weak Foundations."

THE Foundations were theſe: ‡ "I have "obſerv'd in the Reign of *Richard* II. that "when, after the depoſing of that Prince, *Henry* "claim'd the Crown, he affected to uſe obſcure "Expreſſions. His Aim was to make the People believe, there was ſome Foundation in "the Right he pretended to derive from the "firſt Houſe of *Lancaſter*, of which he was "Heir by his Mother. But this Pretext, "which might then have ſome Effect upon "ſuch as *voluntarily* ſhut their Eyes, was too "groſs to deceive any longer. It was there-

* Page 485. ‡ Ibid.

" fore neceſſary for the new King, to find ſome
" plauſible Title to juſtify the Nation's Choice
" of his Perſon. There was none more lawful
" than the Service he had juſt done the State:
" But he judg'd it dangerous to reſt his Right
" upon ſuch a Foundation. When he was to
" receive the Crown, he very willingly own'd
" the Parliament's Power to confer it upon
" him: But when it was once plac'd on his
" Head, he was afraid, from that Principle it
" would be inferr'd, that they who had given
" the Crown, had Power to take it away. He
" was therefore under ſome Perplexity. It was
" requiſite the People ſhould be ſatisfied, that
" the Parliament could lawfully depoſe *Ri-*
" *chard*, and that their Authority was ſupe-
" rior to the King's. On the other Hand, it
" was convenient to let them underſtand, that
" in placing *Henry* on the Throne, the ſame
" Parliament proceeded not by Way of Autho-
" rity, and could not diſpenſe with owning
" him for King. In a Word, they were to
" acknowledge in the Parliament an unlimited
" Power with Reſpect to *Richard*'s depoſing,
" and to decline their Authority in the laſt
" Election. Theſe two Things ſeem'd irrecon-
" cileable. But when a Man has Power on his
" Side, he does not ſo much trouble himſelf
" about finding good Reaſons, as about daz-
" zling the Publick with Appearances. *Henry*,
" perſuaded that in this Juncture, no one
" would have the Boldneſs to contradict him,
" reſolv'd to let his Subjects know, he did not
" mean to derive his Right from their Con-
" ſent. On his very Coronation-Day he pub-
" liſh'd a Proclamation, declaring, that he
" aſcended the Throne, firſt, by Right of Con-

" queſt;

" queſt; ſecondly, by Virtue of *Richard's* " Reſignation, and Deſignation of him for his " Succeſſor; laſtly, as he was the next Male- " Heir of the late King. By this Means he " excluded the only lawful Title he had, name- " ly, the General Conſent of the People, in " order to build his Claim upon three mani- " feſtly weak Foundations."

THIS Author goes on to unravel *Henry's* Pretenſions, which he calls *Dazzling Appearances*, uſurping the Place of *Good Reaſons*. He has found out a good Title for *Henry*, which *Henry* overlook'd. Perhaps *Henry* had as little Confidence in *Rapin's Dazzling Appearances*, as *Rapin* has in *Henry's*. *Rapin* ſeems to have been cut out for Empire, having one Weapon more to defend Poſſeſſion than the craftieſt Poſſeſſors knew.

BUT who will ſay, they did not know it? What Diſcoveries has he made? Here was the Word *Wrong* to be transform'd into *Right*. Whether this was to be done by Etymology, various Copies, learn'd Interpreters, or Decyphering, it was all a Caſe. *Henry*, as he knew no Advocates could do him Good, would not take up with ſuch as would do him Hurt. He would not employ a Tinker, that by ſtopping one Hole ſhould make two. Alas, poor Original Contract! Where were thy Sons employ'd, who at ſo critital a Juncture neglected a Precedent? Why did they, *Nemine Contradicente*, ſuffer Conqueſt, Reſignation, Deſignation, Male-Inheritance, to ſend Thee into perpetual Baniſhment, without any more *Veſtigia* of thine Exiſtence than are to be found in the Brains of Enthuſiaſts and Projectors?

MR. *Rapin* has here done no more than the Work of a Demoliſher. What has he ſaid to ſupport *the only lawful Title* Henry *had*; as he is pleas'd to deliver himſelf in the Line above cited? Where has he ſhew'd the Lawfulneſs of it? The Law upon which his Claim was founded?

IN this very Paragraph has he deſcended to explain away what he had aſſerted. "The "only Title he *(Henry)* could have produced "with any Colour, was the Conſent of the Peo- "ple." So that a *Lawful Title* is dwindled into a *Colour of Title*: In other Words, according to *Rapin*, a *Lawful Title* is brought to a *Sham-Title*. *HENRY* had profited more by *Æſop* than he would have done by *Rapin*.

OUR Author, being upon *Colours*, puts me in Mind of Lord *Bacon* in his *Fable of the Colours of Good and Evil* *. "Hereof *Æſop* fram'd "the Fable of the two Frogs that conſulted to- "gether in the Time of Drowth, (when many "Plaſhes that they had repair'd to were dry) "what was to be done. And the one pro- "pounded to go down into a deep Well, be- "cauſe it was like the Water would not fail "there. But the other anſwered, Yea, but if it "do fail, how ſhall we get up again? And "the Reaſon is, that Human Actions are ſo "uncertain, and ſubject to Perils, as that "ſeemeth the beſt Courſe which hath moſt Paſ- "ſages out of it. Appertaining to this Per- "ſuaſion the Forms are; *You ſhall engage your "ſelf*: On the other Side, *Tantum quantum "voles ſumes ex Fortunâ*: you ſhall keep the "Matter in your own Hand."

* Chap. IV.

RAPIN

RAPIN ſhews his great Knowledge of *Engliſh* Hiſtory in the following Remark upon *Henry* VII. ‡ " Herein he found his own Profit; " for by tranſlating Biſhops from one See to " another, he made the more Vacancies, and " conſequently the Firſt-Fruits which accrued " to the King were greatly multiplied. " That the Firſt-Fruits were in that King's Reign paid to the Pope is plain.

ANNO 25 *Hen.* VIII. Cap. 20. *An Act for the Non-payment of Firſt-Fruits to the Biſhop of* ROME.

" WHERE ſithen the Beginning of this pre- " ſent Parliament for repreſs of the Exaction of " *Annates* and Firſt-Fruits of Archbiſhopricks " and Biſhopricks of this Realm wrongfully " taken by the Biſhops of *Rome*, otherwiſe " call'd the *Pope*, and the See of *Rome*, it is or- " dain'd and eſtabliſh'd by an Act, among " other Things, that the Payments of the *An-* " *nates* or Firſt-Fruits, and all Manner of Con- " tributions for the ſame, for any ſuch Arch- " biſhoprick or Biſhoprick, or for any Bulls to " be obtain'd from the See of *Rome*, to or for " the ſaid Purpoſe or Intent, ſhould utterly " ceaſe, and no ſuch to be paid for any Arch- " biſhoprick or Biſhoprick within this Realm, " otherwiſe than by the ſame Act is expreſſed. "

ANNO 26 *Hen.* VIII. Cap. 3. *The Bill for the Firſt-Fruits with the yearly Penſions to the King.*

SECT. 2. " That is to ſay, that the King's " Heirs and Succeſſors, Kings of this Realm, " ſhall have and enjoy from Time to Time, to " endure for ever, of every ſuch Perſon and

‡ Page 652. Anno 1485.

" Perſons

" Perſons which at any Time after the Firſt of " *January* next coming, ſhall be nominated, " elected, prefected, preſented, collated, or by " any other Means appointed to have any " Archbiſhoprick, Biſhoprick, ——— the Firſt-" Fruits, Revenues, and Profits, for one Year, " of every ſuch Archbiſhoprick, Biſhoprick, " ——— ſhall ſatisfy, content, and pay, or " compound or agree to pay to the King's Uſe, " at reaſonable Days, upon good Securities, " the ſaid Firſt-Fruits and Profits for one " Year."

THIS is repeal'd Anno 1 and 2 *Phil.* & *Mar.* Cap. 8. The Title of the Act is; *An Act repealing all Articles and Proviſions made againſt the Sea Apoſtolick of* Rome *ſince the twentieth Year of King* Henry *VIIIth, and for the Eſtabliſhment of all Spiritual and Eccleſiaſtical Poſſeſſions and Hereditaments conveyed to the Laity.*

SECT. 9. " And one other Act entitled, " One Act reſtraining the ſaid Payments of " *Annates* or Firſt-Fruits to the Biſhop of *Rome*, " and of the electing and conſecrating of the " Archbiſhops and Biſhops within this Realm."

WE have another Act, Anno 1 *Eliz.* entitled; *An Act for the Reſtitution of the Firſt-Fruits to the Crown.*

SECT. 1. ——— " And that every ſuch " Perſon and Perſons, before any actual or " real Poſſeſſion, or meddling with the Profits " of any ſuch Archbiſhoprick, Biſhoprick, Ab-" bacy, Monaſtery, College, Hoſpital, Deanry, " Provoſtſhip, Prebend, Parſonage, Vicarage, " Chantry, Free-Chapel, Priory, or other Dig-" nity, Benefice, Office, or Promotion Spiritual, " ſhould ſatisfy, content and pay, or compound " or agree to pay, to the King's Uſe, at rea-

" ſonable

" ſonable Days, upon good Sureties, the ſaid " Firſt-Fruits and Profits for one Year. "

THIS Author tells us himſelf, *Anno* 1532, in the Reign of *Henry* VIII. " Care was " taken to make the Eccleſiaſticks amends, by " paſſing an Act to releaſe them from the Pay- " ment of *Annates*, which was become a heavy " Burthen. The Act ran, that the Kingdom " was daily impoveriſh'd by the great Sums " paid to the See of *Rome* for Firſt-Fruits, for " Palls, for Bulls, *&c.* That ſince the ſecond " Year of the Reign of *Henry* VII. One hun- " dred and ſixty thouſand Pounds had been " paid on that Score, and that the Detriment " the Kingdom receiv'd from thence was like " to be ſtill greater, by reaſon many of the " Biſhops were very aged: That beſides, the " *Annates* were firſt introduc'd only as a Con- " tribution towards the War againſt the Infi- " dels, to which Uſe, however, they were " never put. "

I KNOW of no Hiſtory out of which the Story of *Henry* Seventh's ſqueezing Firſt-Fruits from tranſlating Biſhops, could be pick'd. Nor will any body go about to clear his rapacious Hands from any thing he could lay hold of. Yet, if we have Facts related without Foundation, and contradictory to one another, we ſhall have the leſs Reaſon to take this Author's Word upon other Occaſions.*

HIS Reflection upon *Catherine* of *Spain*, to diſintereſted Judges, muſt ſeem barbarous †. " Nevertheleſs, ſhe may be juſtly ſuſpected of " having taken a falſe Oath, to give her Cauſe

† Page 466. firſt Edit.

" the

" the better Colour." This Oath was, that her Marriage was not conſummated with *Arthur*.

He had before told us upon the Divorce *, " The Proofs conſiſted in the Age, Health, and " vigorous Conſtitution of the Prince, and in " his Diſcourſes next Morning after the Wed- " ding: So that *Arthur* or *Catherine* muſt ne- " ceſſarily not have ſpoken the Truth, the one " out of Vanity, or the other out of Intereſt."

This Author has heavily loaded all *Catherine*'s Accuſers with Inſincerity. He would, indeed, clear her Judge Archbiſhop *Cranmer* in the following Manner ‡; " As for the *Engliſh* " Clergy, they had juſt receiv'd ſuch a Check, " that they had Reaſon to dread giving the " King a freſh Occaſion of Anger. But it can- " not be inferr'd from thence, that they went " contrary to their Sentiments, ſince it often " happens, that Truth is not contrary to our " Intereſt. The ſame may be ſaid of *Cranmer*, " who having already embrac'd *Luther*'s Doc- " trine, could not look upon *Julius*'s Diſpen- " ſation as capable of rendering a Marriage " valid, which in itſelf was null and repug- " nant to the Law of God. The Truth is, he " may have earneſtly laid hold on this Oppor- " tunity to give a mortal Wound to the *Papal* " Authority, in order to promote the Buſineſs " of the Reformation. But it cannot be af- " firm'd, that he acted againſt his Knowledge, " in pronouncing the Sentence of Divorce: At " leaſt his whole Behaviour was diametrically " oppoſite to ſuch indirect Practices."

* Page 392. ‡ Page 468.

That

THAT Good may be brought out of Ill, is very certain: That is, Providence may do it from corrupt Inſtruments. But that affords them no Excuſe to do Ill that Good may come of it. Nor is it an Excuſe for Mr. *Rapin*'s Freedom, to ſay he ſets up for a Skreen to Ill Inſtruments of Good.

WHAT had this Woman done, as far as comes to our Knowledge, in the Courſe of her Life, that will fix an Accuſation, I may ſay, a Suſpicion of her? Why then muſt ſhe be treated as a perjur'd Perſon, for oppoſing thoſe who acted for Intereſt or for Fear?

HERE's a ſmart Oppoſition of Vanity and Intereſt. "*Arthur* or *Catherine* muſt neceſſa-"rily not have ſpoken the Truth; the one out "of Vanity, or the other out of Intereſt." Here's a Speech ſet againſt an Oath: A Speech too recorded by ſuch as were capable enough of being hir'd or frighten'd to report it. It is happy for the Memory of that innocent Princeſs, that there was a Biſhop of *Rocheſter* who had the Courage to oppoſe ſo powerful a Torrent. The Notes upon *Rapin* quote the Paſſage ‡ from Dr. *Burnet*'s Hiſtory of the Reformation. "The King's Council, it ſeems, in-"ſiſting moſtly on the Conſummation of the "Marriage, it led them to ſay many Things "that were indecent; of which the Biſhop of "*Rocheſter* complain'd, and ſaid they were "Things deteſtable to be heard."

THE Term *Deteſtable*, may have Regard to their being forg'd as well as divulg'd. They who encourag'd the producing them, may, from the reſt of their Behaviour, with a better Grace

* Page 393.

be accus'd of forging them, at leaſt of enlarging them, than *Catherine* can be ſuſpected of Perjury: Nor was there enough in the Words to prove her perjur'd. If *Fiſher* had not ſtopp'd them, perhaps the Evidence had been fuller ſtill: But ſuch is frequently the Impotence of Impoſture, as to fall before Truth and Courage, though ſingle and unguarded.

It was not the Queſtion, whether the Diſpenſation of *Julius* was valid? But whether it was eſteem'd ſo by the Contracting Parties, by their Parents, and their Council, as *Catherine* affirm'd. If ever the Rule, *Quod fieri non debit factum valet*, ſhould take Place, here was a Time for it. The Thing was paſt, and if the King's Scruples would not ſuffer him to be eaſy in what was a Crime to continue in, he might have offer'd it to his Queen to have liv'd in a ſeparate State, in which, it may be, Providence would have diſſolv'd the Marriage by her Death.

Infallible as the Pope was taken to be, why ſhould he imagine the Decree of the preſent Pope could have more Force than that of his Predeceſſor? It was the Notion of the Age, that the Pope's Authority could ſupply Defects, and remove the Obſtacles of Law and Nature. If he reckon'd his firſt Marriage againſt the Law of God, he had as much in his own Power as the Pope could give him, to forbear an Inceſtuous Commerce.

If the want of Male-Heirs to his Crown was one of his chief Motives, even in that was he deceiv'd, when he had broke through ſo much to obtain one; the Son he left dying in Minority. He call'd it a Divine Judgment inflicted on him, for his unlawful Marriage, that his Iſſue

Iſſue by *Catherine* (ſome of them) died young: What muſt he have thought, had he foreſeen the Failure of them from ſuch accumulated Stems?

THIS Affair of Prohibitions and Diſpenſations of the Papacy ſtill keeps up its Credit amongſt Princes of the *Romiſh* Communion. It has fill'd many a Coffer, the forbidding Marriage in Degrees not forbidden by the *Levitical* Law, for the ſake of admitting it by Diſpenſation. It ſeems to have been the Deſire of *Clement*, that *Henry* ſhould have ventur'd upon his ſecond Marriage without his Leave, that he might have been well paid for Diſpenſing with it when done; ſince he might in ſome meaſure by thoſe Means have ſecur'd the Reputation of his Predeceſſor's Infallibility, by Indulgence to the King, rather than deciding againſt the Pope.

THOUGH foreign to my preſent Buſineſs, I cannot help mentioning an Article in the Prints, tranſlated from the *Dutch* News. "That "a *Mooriſh* Prince lately turn'd Chriſtian at "*Rome*, has had the Favour of a Congrega- "tion of Divines, to determine whether his "Marriage with a Woman of his own Country, "whom he has left in a *Seraglio* in *Barbary*, "ſhould ſubſiſt, ſince it was no Sacrament."

THIS is diſſolving the Ordinances of Nature, as if no Marriage-Contract could be good before Marriage was call'd a Sacrament: Whereas the Office is only to atteſt the Conſent of Parties, at their Liberty to marry, and to pronounce a Bleſſing upon it.

ONE would have thought the moſt hard-hearted Hiſtorian ſhould have a little relented, and retracted his Suſpicion of *Catherine*'s Per-

jury, when he came to relate and to acknowledge her pious End. * "Queen *Catherine* "ended her Days the Beginning of the Year "1536. Though her Virtue had gain'd her "an univerſal Eſteem, ſhe died, however, little "lamented by the Publick, becauſe ſhe em-"baraſs'd alike her Friends and Enemies. Be-"fore ſhe expir'd, ſhe dictated a very tender "Letter to the King. My moſt Dear Lord, "King and Husband, *I make this Vow, that "mine Eyes deſire you above all Things.* She "adviſ'd him to look to the Health of his Soul. "She forgave him all the Troubles he had caſt "her into. She recommended their Daughter "*Mary* to him, deſiring he would be a loving "Father to her. She alſo deſir'd he would "provide Matches for her Maids, who were "but three; and that he would give her Ser-"vants one Year's Wages more than was due "to them. She was a devout and pious Prin-"ceſs, and led a ſevere Life. In her Great-"neſs, ſhe wrought much with her own Hand, "and kept her Women well employ'd about "her, as appear'd when the two Legates came "once to ſpeak with her, ſhe came out to "them with a Skein of Silk about her Neck, "and told them, ſhe had been within at work "with her Maids. Few ſuch Queens now-"a-Days."

Could a Perſon deſerving this Character die guilty of Perjury unconfeſs'd to her moſt dear Lord, King and Husband? She had put her Refuſal of the Divorce upon her Marriage being unconſummated with *Arthur*. This ſhe had atteſted upon Oath; and it was but a juſt

* Page 509.

Debt

Debt to *Henry*, to own to him at her Death what ſhe had falſely ſworn, becauſe the Charge was very heavy laid upon him by the World upon the Evidence ſhe had given.

It is trifling with Mankind, if not much worſe, to treat them with Hiſtory of this Kind; unleſs the Inconſiſtency of the Relation will prevent their giving too much heed to it: Then indeed the Miſchief was only deſign'd, not done.

It would be very hard to find an Excuſe for the Freedom Mr. *Rapin* * takes with the Monaſteries; accuſing them of ſuch monſtrous Crimes, as are not to be credited, without better Proof than he brings. It were even barbarous to inſinuate their Guilt from the Proofs their Viſitors pretended to give, ſince the candid Part of Mankind will eaſily admit the latter as capable of Forgery, as the Religious capable of ſo general Corruption. We ſhould indeed ſuffer our ſelves to be ſtrangely impos'd upon, if we ſhould give Credit even to the Confeſſions of theſe unhappy People upon delivering up their Poſſeſſions to the Ravager. They were afraid to juſtify their Conduct before ſuch a Supreme Head as they had to deal with. To prevent the Miſeries of a ſtarving State, they ſaid and unſaid, ſwore and abjur'd, whatever a haughty and revengeful Spirit dictated; and gave up Conſcience and Honour, that they might *eat a Piece of Bread.* To damn one half and ſtarve the other, was not ſo glorious a Propoſal as to deſerve the Approbation of ſo diſtant Poſterity as our ſelves! It was an excellent Method of Revenge upon the

* Page 506,

Pope,

Pope, to ſhew the Clergy ſo much to Diſadvantage!

For this Inſult upon the Morals of the Recluſe, our Author has taken Sanctuary in the Hiſtory of the Reformation: * "In ſome they "found the Inſtruments and other Tools for "multiplying and coining. But for the Lewd-"neſs of the Confeſſors of Nunneries, and the "great Corruption of that State, whole Houſes "being found almoſt all with Child: For the "Diſſoluteneſs of Abbots and the other Monks "and Friars, not only with Harlots but mar-"ried Women; and for their unnatural Luſts "and other brutal Practices: Theſe, ſays *Bur-"net*, are not fit to be ſpoken of, much leſs "enlarg'd on in a Work of this Nature. The "full Report of this Viſitation is loſt; yet "*Burnet* ſaw an Extract of a Part of it con-"cerning 144 Houſes, that contains Abomina-"tions in it equal to any that were in *Sodom*." *Burnet*, Vol. I. Page 191.

Who was it that deſtroy'd this *full Report of the Viſitation?* Why was it not preſerv'd for Juſtification of the Action? Dr. *Burnet* had ſeen an *Extract of a Part of it!* There are Alchymiſts that can extract Dirt from Gold; that can embelliſh Vice and blacken Virtue. If the Houſes that have been converted to Secular Uſe, had been as often forfeited as they have been liable to theſe Accuſations, they would have chang'd Owners oftner than they have done. Doth any Man, reſolv'd to enrich himſelf by Violence, enquire how the Poſſeſſor came by what he wants? Whether by honeſt Means or otherwiſe? If that would ſerve him

* Notes on Page 506.

for

for Excuſe, he would find out enough to load the bilk'd Owner with, and engage to employ the Treaſure better.

THERE ſeems nothing more wanting to ſet the Deſign in a proper Light, than this: That the Hoſpitals which could not be charg'd with any of theſe Immoralities, underwent the ſame Fate.

THERE were many for Lepers and other diſeaſed Perſons, which were ſwallow'd up in the common Ruin. The general Cry againſt the Monaſteries was ſufficient to take in even theſe. Leproſy was more frequent than afterwards; perhaps not more than at preſent from another Cauſe. It was then much owing to the ſedentary Life of the Recluſe, and to a *Lenten* Diet, and more common in the Monaſteries than elſewhere. This might have been dubbed a Reaſon for diſſolving them, becauſe when the other were gone, theſe would not be ſo much wanted.

IT'S ſomething hard to gueſs, why theſe Unnatural Crimes are call'd *Brutal Practices*, ſince Brutes abhor them. It is indeed a brutal Practice for the Strong to devour the Weak; to gratify their own Appetite at the Expence of thoſe that cannot reſiſt them. This, indeed, they may teach our *Species*, but we cannot bring them to imitate us in the other.

HAD the Corruption been as general as is pretended, there might have been a vaſt Sum rais'd by depriving the Guilty, and leaving to the Innocent their Poſſeſſions: Or the Abuſe might have been cured, by placing in every Houſe ſome of theſe zealous Reformers of Manners. 'Tis eſteem'd barbarous in the *Moors* to deny the Uſe of Surgeons, killing all their wounded

wounded Soldiers. Were the Crimes in all Places ſo heinous, as to give no Room for Repentance? Muſt a whole Society fall under Sentence, becauſe two or three Clippers or Coiners belong to it? At that rate, Cities, Towns, and Villages, would be involv'd in private Guilt. The Deſtruction was to be as general as that of *Sodom*, therefore the Crime muſt be ſo too!

WHY ſhould we fly to Queen *Mary*'s Reign for the Deſtruction of the Returns of the Viſitors? Becauſe they are not to be ſeen, they muſt have been then ſuppreſs'd! If there was no Truth in their Accounts, or ſo little that the Pretence was eaſily ſeen through, Who ſhould confound ſuch Evidences but the Authors of them? The Friars Confeſſions are many of them extant, which may be thought as fit to be conceal'd by Queen *Mary* as the reſt. The Original Returns would have juſtified the Sufferers rather than their Oppreſſors.

WE are told of a Commiſſion given by Queen *Mary* to *Bonner* and others, * "to raze out of "the Publick Records, all that had been done "by *Henry* VIII. againſt the Monks and the "Pope, and particularly the Accounts of the "Viſitation of Monaſteries, and the Renun-"ciations of the Papal Authority by the "Monks."

SO that here, it ſeems, we loſt that valuable Treaſure, the Intrigues between the Nuns and their Confeſſors, and the reſt of the ſame Kind. Where the annulling the Authority of the Pope was made into a Law, it muſt properly be ſaid to have been upon Record: And ſo, probably,

* Page 196.

the

the Abbots and Monks reſigning their Houſes. But how Enquiries after Immoralities and their Returns are ſuppos'd to be upon Record, 'tis not ſo eaſy to underſtand. If they were kept, they were in one Senſe recorded, but not in the Senſe that the Parliament-Rolls and Judgments of *Weſtminſter-Hall* are.

THE general Form of Surrenders, as quoted by *Rapin*'s Notes from the Hiſtory of the Reformation, is aſtoniſhing. Was it not enough to turn out the poor People to ſtarving, or to a Condition very near it; but they muſt be made to own the Juſtice of the Proceeding, and ſolemnly to teſtify their Deſire of it. It puts one in Mind of the Man, who, to ſave his Life, renounc'd Chriſtianity, and was then immediately kill'd. *

"THE general Form in which moſt of the "Surrenders begin, is, That the Abbot and "Brethren, upon full Deliberation, certain "Knowledge, of their own proper Motion, "for certain juſt and reaſonable Cauſes, ſpecially moving them in their Souls and Conſci-"ences, did freely and of their own Accord "give and grant their Houſes to the King."

THEY that would impoſe ſo hard Terms as theſe, cannot be wrong'd by a Suſpicion of filling up the Liſt of Complaints with Matter fit for their Purpoſe, whether upon juſt Grounds or none at all. Neither was it at laſt in the Power of theſe Men to give up their Lands and Houſes. They were founded and ſettled by thoſe that had the Property of them, confirm'd by the Authority of the State. Theſe were but Temporary Poſſeſſors, without a Right to

* Page 570.

alienate. Amongſt all the Founders Curſes denounc'd againſt the Invaders of their Gifts, I do not remember any againſt the Betrayers or Reſigners of them: So little was it eſteem'd in their Power to do it. Nor was the Title to the new Owners made from the Abbots and Monks, but from the King by Act of Parliament. A Refuſal was immediate Hanging: The Title from Act of Parliament: Why then ſhould a forc'd Submiſſion be inſiſted on, which convey'd no Right to the Purchaſer? To what Purpoſe was the Foppery and Abuſe of Relicks ſo loudly exclaim'd againſt? Might not St. *Thomas* of *Canterbury*'s Boots, and the Parings of St. *Edmond*'s Nails, have been thrown away or buried, without involving the Houſes where they were ſhewn in Treaſon? *Thou that abhorreſt Idols, doſt Thou commit Sacrilege!*

PRETENCES for doing what a Man has a Mind to, ſhould ſurely be diſtinguiſh'd from Reaſons that weigh with Reaſonable Men. It would be as vain to go about to clear the Sufferers from all that they are accus'd of, as it is unjuſt to believe their Accuſers. It muſt at laſt be ſaid, that it was one of the moſt unfortunate Ages a Man could be born in, who had no Choice but a miſerable Life or a violent Death; except he would diſrobe himſelf of all that was Honeſt and Manly, and be ſhewn to the World for a Monſter. So wretched was the State of thoſe deſtin'd to be the Sport of Power, ſubject to the Rage of diſappointed Ambition. Only ſome very few, ſuch as *More* and *Fiſher*, had a Title to be call'd Happy, who got clear of their Troubles by the Hands of the Executioner, under ſo rapid a Proſecution, as gave Nature no Opportunity to recurr, before

before oppreſs'd Virtue, worn out with conſtant Struggles, was reduc'd to capitulate.

Mr. *Rapin* hath charg'd the Parliament ſomething too far: He ſays †, "As to the Parliament, they are inexcuſable for having put "into the King's Hands, ſuch immenſe Riches "deſign'd for pious Uſes, without taking Care "about the Manner how they ſhould be laid "out. This is no ſlender Evidence of what "has been already obſerv'd, that the Parliaments met in this Reign merely to be inſtrumental in gratifying the King's Paſſions, without ever examining either the Motives or "Conſequences of what he requir'd of them."

Can any thing have leſs Truth in it than this? It muſt be confeſs'd they ought to have refus'd him. They ſhould have ſacrific'd their Lives and Fortunes rather than their Integrity. But Martyrdom is not ſo eaſily embrac'd, that we ſhould ſtand amaz'd when Men ſtrink from it. Theſe muſt be pious Times, when a Nation's Repreſentatives ſo readily court their Ruin. But what does our Author mean by his *ſlender Evidences?* "The Parliament met "merely to be inſtrumental in gratifying the "King's Paſſions." *Henry* called them together for that Purpoſe; but how did they meet for that Purpoſe, when they made the ſtrongeſt Oppoſition to it, except a Refuſal? "They "never examin'd either the Motives or Conſequences of what he requir'd of them."

Sir *Henry Spelman* is a Writer out of Mr. *Rapin*'s Way. If he had come into it, as little Regard might have been had to him as to ſome other of our beſt Hiſtorians. Thus the pious

† Page 583.

Knight: * " I am now come off the Rivers " into the Ocean of Iniquity and Sacrilege, " where whole Thouſands of Churches and " Chapels, dedicated to the Service of God in " the ſame Manner that the reſt are which re- " main to us at this Day, together with the " Monaſteries and other Houſes of Religion " and intended Piety, were, by K. *Henry* VIII. " in a Temper of Indignation againſt the Clergy " of that Time, mingled with inſatiable Ava- " rice, ſack'd and raz'd, as by an Enemy. It " is true, the Parliament did give them to him, " but ſo unwillingly, (as I have heard) that " when the Bill had ſtuck long in the Lower " Houſe, and could get no Paſſage, he com- " manded the Commons to attend him in the " Forenoon in his Gallery, where he let them " wait till late in the Afternoon: And then " coming out of his Chamber and walking a " Turn or two amongſt them, and looking an- " grily on them, firſt on one Side, then on the " other, at laſt, *I hear* (ſaith he) *that my Bill* " *will not paſs; but I will have it paſs, or I* " *will have ſome of your Heads:* And without " other Rhetorick or Perſuaſion, return'd to " his Chamber. Enough was ſaid, the Bill " paſs'd, and all was given him as he deſir'd."

To ſay one Thing more in Excuſe for the Commons, we have, in the next Page, the King's Aſſurance to them of the good Uſes he intended to put theſe Lands to ‡. " It is to " be obſerv'd that the Parliament did give all " theſe to the King, yet did not ordain them " to be demoliſh'd, or employ'd to any irreli-

* Hiſt. of Sacrilege, Page 183. ‡ Page 184.

" gious

" gious Uſes; leaving it more to the Conſci-
" ence and Piety of the King, who in a Speech
" to the Parliament, promis'd to perform the
" Truſt, wherein he ſaith,——I can not a little
" rejoice, when I conſider the perfect Truth *
" and Confidence which you have put in me,
" in my good Doings and juſt Proceedings;
" for you, without my Deſire and Requeſt,
" have committed to my Order and Diſpoſi-
" tion, all Chauntries, Colleges, and Hoſpitals,
" and other Places, ſpecified in a certain Act,
" firmly truſting that I will order them to the
" Glory of God, and the Profit of the Com-
" monwealth. Surely, if I, contrary to your
" Expectation, ſhould ſuffer the Miniſters of
" the Churches to decay, or Learning (which
" is ſo great a Jewel) to be miniſhed, or the
" Poor and Miſerable to be unrelieved, you
" might well ſay, that I being put in ſuch a
" ſpecial Truſt, as I am in this Caſe, were no
" truſty Friend to you, nor charitable to my
" Emne-Chriſten, neither a Lover of the Pub-
" lick Wealth; nor yet one that fear'd God,
" to whom Account muſt be render'd of all
" our Doings; doubt not, I pray you, but
" your Expectation ſhall be ſerved more Godly
" and Goodly, than you will wiſh or deſire, as
" hereafter you ſhall plainly perceive."

In the Page of *Rapin* laſt quoted, we have this: " *Henry* had alſo form'd the Project of
" founding a College for young Students, that
" might qualify themſelves for the Service of
" the State, either in Embaſſies or other Af-
" fairs of the Government."

* Perhaps it ſhould be Truſt.

THE Notes from the Hiſtory of the Reformation ſay; "As this was the nobleſt Deſign "that ever was projected in *England*, it will "not be amiſs to give a ſhort Account of it. ——"This noble Deſign miſcarried, but if it "had been well regulated, it is eaſy to gather "what great and publick Advantages might "have flow'd from it. Among which it is not "inconſiderable, that we ſhould have been "deliver'd from a *Rabble of Ill Writers of "Hiſtory*, who have, without due Care or En-"quiry, deliver'd to us the Tranſactions of "that Time ſo imperfectly, that there is ſtill "need of enquiring into Regiſters and Papers "for theſe Matters."

IT were well if the *Rabble of Writers* had no more to reproach themſelves with than Ignorance. They ſometimes condeſcend to cry up and cry down, juſt as it ſuits the Inclination of their Readers. There's too much of the Hero often attributed, where the Action is ſo far from commendable, that it is not juſt. What is there at laſt in this *Noble Deſign*, ſo Noble that it was never Deſign'd? Why elſe did it miſcarry? And how ſhould we have deſcried the Nobility of it? Taking away what was ſolemnly dedicated to other Uſes for the Improvement of Ambaſſadors and a Rabble of Writers? If *Nobilitas* conſiſts in Virtue, it would have ſent back the Lands to their primitive Employment: At leaſt where Superſtition and the reſt of the traiterous Symptoms had appear'd, the Founder's Deſign for Piety, Learning, and Relief of the Poor, might have been kept in View, preſerving the Subſtance though the Circumſtances were changed.

ONE Thing is to be remember'd of the Chantry Prieſts; that their Employment was not only to ſing for the Souls of their Founders; but they were oblig'd to aſſiſt in the Cure of the Pariſh where they dwelt.

RAPIN, after all his Surprizes at the mean Behaviour of the *Engliſh* Parliaments, gives the Reaſon himſelf, yet lets his deep Remarks continue *: "We may farther obſerve here "the ſervile Compliance of the Parliament, "who did not dare to condemn the Queen and "her Complices, without knowing whether the "King would be pleas'd to let them be pu-"niſh'd. They did not proceed in this Man-"ner with regard to *Ann Bullen*, and the Lord "*Rochford*, becauſe the King's Authority was "not ſo overgrown, as it was at the Time I "am ſpeaking of."

THE Parliament are farther loaded by this Author beyond Right and Reaſon: And the Princeſſes, Daughters of *Henry*, ſo repreſented, or enquir'd into by ſuch an indecent Name as becomes none but ſo free-ſpoken an Hiſtorian. ‡ "I have obſerv'd ſeveral Times, that the "Parliament was held in Subjection, and did "nothing but what the King pleas'd. Of this "we have had ſundry Inſtances, but none more "flagrant than the preſent one. In this Act "Prince *Edward* was placed firſt with his Iſſue. "In the ſecond Place, the King's Heirs Male "by his preſent Queen, or by any other he "might marry hereafter, with their Iſſue. In "the third Place, the Princeſs *Mary* and her "Line. Laſtly, the Princeſs *Elizabeth* and "her Heirs. But there was no Mention of the

* Page 619. ‡ Page 654.

"King's

" King's Divorces from the Queens, Mothers
" to theſe two Princeſſes. So notwithſtanding
" the Acts which had approv'd and confirm'd
" theſe Divorces, and which had never been
" repeal'd, the Parliament ſeem'd to conſider
" theſe Princeſſes as Legitimate, tho' before-
" hand they had been declar'd . . . . . and
" as ſuch had been excluded from the Succeſ-
" ſion. On the other Side, to let the Prin-
" ceſſes ſee they were beholden to the King
" their Father for this Favour, the Act made
" them liable to ſuch Limitations or Condi-
" tions as the King ſhould pleaſe to lay upon
" them, on Pain of forfeiting the Right that
" was granted them. Moreover, in caſe of
" Diſobedience on their Part, or if they died
" without Heirs, the Parliament gave the King
" Power to ſettle the Crown on any other by
" his Letters Patent, or by his Laſt Will ſign'd
" with his own Hand. Was not this conſider-
" ing theſe two Princeſſes as . . . . . ſince the
" Right to their Succeſſion was made to depend
" upon the King their Father's Pleaſure?
" Without taking upon me to call in queſtion
" the King's and the Repreſentatives of the
" Nation's Right to ſettle the Succeſſion as
" they pleaſe, I cannot forbear remarking here,
" that this Right was carried, upon this Occa-
" ſion, as far as it can be ſtretch'd. Upon
" Suppoſition that theſe two Princeſſes were
" . . . . . the Parliament granted the King the
" Power of calling them to the Throne, con-
" trary to the Laws and Cuſtoms of the Land
" ever ſince the Conqueſt. On the other
" Hand, ſuppoſing them to be Legitimate, the
" King had Liberty given him to debar them
" of the Succeſſion, contrary to the ſame Laws

" and

" and Cuſtoms, ſince it was in his Power to lay " upon them ſuch Conditions as it was impoſſi- " ble for them to perform. This was a Power " no King of *England* had ever enjoyed, and " which ſhews that this Act flow'd not ſo " much from the Parliament as from the King " himſelf. "

THIS Foreigner, with all his Pretences to Knowledge, has much exceeded the Bounds of Modeſty, *in taking upon himſelf*, as he is pleas'd to ſpeak, to cenſure the Proceedings of the Parliament, and the Title of the two Queens. The Parliament were over-aw'd by a Power that had cruſh'd them ; that had broken their Spirit, and reduc'd them to implicit Obedience. But how is this the moſt *flagrant* Enormity they had, or their Predeceſſors, (for he ſpeaks as if the Parliament were always the ſame) been drawn into ? It were happy for them if they had no more to anſwer for than this. The King, become ſenſible of his ill Treatment to his Queens, would preſerve the Inheritance of the Crown to their Children. The Daughters, however free Mr. *Rapin* treats them, could not be both Illegitimate. One of them muſt be born in Wedlock. If the Mother of the latter was charg'd with, and condemn'd for Misbehaviour, that barrs not her Daughter of inheriting : Not to mention the great Suſpicion of her being too ſeverely judged. One of them had a contingent Right. Nor were there any other to claim, but from *Scotland*, who could not come in till after one of theſe Daughters. So the Parliament, ſubmitting to the King's Pleaſure, agreed to a Succeſſion which they had before join'd with him in fixing and altering as he pleas'd. If they had by the King's Influence

injur'd one of theſe Princeſſes, what could they do better than Bp. *Merks* propos'd upon the Depoſition of *Richard*; to undo that juſtly, which they had unjuſtly done?

THE following Expreſſion ſounds amiſs from one ſo much an Adept in *the Laws and Cuſtoms of the Land.* "The King had Liberty "given him to ſettle the Succeſſion." From whom is the Authority of an Act deriv'd but from the King? The Crown has limited itſelf to enact nothing without the Approbation of the Parliament. But it does not thence follow that his Power is a Liberty given him by the Subject.

I CANNOT yet be convinc'd that both theſe Princeſſes can be in the ſame State of Diſability. If not, though the Conſtitution has been long ſince the Conqueſt alter'd, or, as ſome call it, reſtor'd, how comes Mr. *Rapin* to affirm ſuch a Thing has never been done ſince the Conqueſt, when *Rufus* himſelf came in only by the Conqueror's Deſignation, and that without a Parliament? He ſaith, indeed, ſuch a Thing has not been done by any Parliament, though he lays, I preſume, his Streſs upon its not being done in favour of a . . . . . which he has not yet prov'd to be a juſt Appellation. He will not ſay *Rufus* had a better Title than if it had been confirm'd in Parliament. He ſaith, indeed, in the Life of *Edward* VI. ‡ "That the Marriages of theſe two Princeſſes "Mothers were alike annull'd." But there's a vaſt Difference in the annulling, and in the Reaſons of annulling them, as has been obſerv'd. Annulling of a Right to inherit was

‡ Page 106.

eaſily

eaſily brought about. Both *Mary* and *Elizabeth*'s were annull'd to make room for the Duke of *Northumberland*'s Project of ſetting up the Lady *Jane Grey*. This occaſion'd a very nice Diſtinction. *Rapin* ſaith *, "Archbiſhop *Cranmer* abſented himſelf to avoid ſigning the "Settlement; but the King importun'd him ſo "much, that he ſet his Hand at laſt as a Witneſs, as it is pretended, and not as a Privy-"Counſellor." It is agreed *Cecil* uſed the Diſtinction, which yet ſeems to be a Diſtinction without a Difference.

HERE was no canvaſſing of the Right of either Princeſs; the Caſe was, indeed, perplex'd before, but the Duke of *Northumberland*'s ſetting them both aſide, only becauſe *The Lady* Jane Grey *was an accompliſh'd Lady both in Body and Mind*, hath no Force in determining againſt the Legitimacy of either.

THE beſt Caſuiſts would, perhaps, be at a Loſs to decide the Right of one of theſe againſt the other; ſo much is to be ſaid for both one and the other. There is a Difference in deciding after a Caſe happens and before. Some Circumſtances there may be which will countenance an Allowance of Things paſt, which would not juſtify the chuſing them before. On this Foot, that the Caſe is not clear which Queen has a Right to the opprobrious Name Mr. *Rapin* gives, he may chance to give it to the wrong, with all his pretended Sagacity. And ſuch a Name as he throws about, and repeats ſo frequently, of one and the other, in the Beginning of the Reign of *Elizabeth*, would

* Page 107.

ſound very ill, if it ſhould not happen to fall upon the proper Perſon *.

It is inſolent in a Foreigner to treat the Memory of thoſe who have worn the Crown of *England*, with ſuch Language as ought not to have been given to his Equals, upon Suſpicion, or Appearance of Difficulties, as much out of his Power, as his Right to judge of. We do not find either of the Siſters, when in Poſſeſſion, expoſing the Defects of the other's Birth. They were more concern'd to do it againſt each other, than any body is againſt either of them. We find, indeed, Queen *Mary* repealing the Acts which appoint the Divorce, juſtifying her Mother's Marriage, and blaming the Promoters of the Divorce. But nothing appears of her Deſign to exclude her Siſter from ſucceeding, whatever Apprehenſions ſhe might have of her acting counter to the Meaſures herſelf had taken to reſtore Popery. Zealous as ſhe was that Way, ſhe might have taken the Advantage in favour of the *Scotch* Family, more like to proſecute her Deſigns. Nor has Queen *Elizabeth* endeavour'd to caſt that Odium upon her Siſter's Birth, which, if the Caſe was ſo plain to her, ſhe might have attempted. For what appears, either of them thought the other capable of inheriting, notwithſtanding what had been alledg'd, even without the Appointment of *Henry*'s Will. Queen *Elizabeth* might have undertaken a Defence of her Mother's Marriage, as the other had done, at no greater Expence than blaming her Father and his Adviſers.

He that looks at theſe Things impartially, without being biaſs'd by *Jeſuits* or *Republicans*,

* Page 219.

will

will not find Reaſon to call Things by the ſame hard Names which *Henry's* Acts of Parliament have done. When he had a Mind to be divorc'd, in order to a future Marriage, by which he hoped for Sons, he would have his Daughters pronounc'd Illegitimate, to make his Way. His Paſſions ſubdu'd Reaſon and Decency, in himſelf and his Parliament both. But ſo diſtant Spectators as the preſent Age, will ſhew but little Humanity, in taking Things in as bad a Senſe as they did, whoſe Throats the Monarch cramm'd them down.

If we ſuppoſe a Caſe of a Match, indeed, within the Degrees forbidden by the *Levitical* Law between Proteſtants, which there has been no Proceſs to diſſolve or condemn; and the Children or Grandchildren of this, not lawful, Marriage, married and allied to other Families, would it not be eſteem'd hard to unravel the firſt, and to cut off from Inheritance the innocent Poſterity, becauſe the firſt of their Family were not regularly brought together. We ſhould wiſh, in ſuch a Caſe, that the proper Authority ſhould take off the Diſability of inheriting, though the ſame Authority would not and could not have conſented to the firſt Act. With this Power, no Doubt, the Spiritual Authority of every Nation is inveſted, though they do not, with the Merchant of *Rome*, diſpenſe with Laws in order to the breaking them, and diſſolve Mens Obedience to a Divine Inſtitution.

If the Defect in Birth deſerv'd the Name Mr. *Rapin* gives, it's ungenerous to purſue the innocent Off-ſpring with Reproaches. The only Reaſon that the Law pronounces ſo ſeverely againſt ſuch unhappy Perſons, is to prevent the like Irregularities for the future; to entrench

Virtue

Virtue by Security of Inheritance, and to puniſh Vice by diſabling the Deſcendants of a criminal Commerce from claiming an Equality with the other.

THE Sex too, where they are chargeable with no Fault of their own, being leſs capable of defending themſelves, have a Right to the Favour and Compaſſion of Mankind, that they will give the moſt friendly Interpretation of Points not throughly clear.

HAVING thus far eſcorted Mr. *Rapin*, and obſerv'd that many Things through Error, and many through Deſign, are miſrepreſented by him; that I may not ſeem to charge him for ſmall Faults, I proceed with his indecent Treatment of the Chriſtian Religion. The zealous Endeavour of ſuch as would ſet it aſide as Impoſture, hath not yet been ſo entirely ſucceſsful, but that it is ſtill an Offence to ſome Ears, even of the Laity, to hear it publickly arraign'd and condemn'd. I have already obſerv'd that this Author, in his Introduction, has accus'd the *Druids* of thruſting themſelves into an Office not at all belonging to them: That under the Notion of Prieſts, they made themſelves Judges and Dividers, uſurping an Authority they had no Right to exerciſe. His Remark is, "The "Chriſtian Clergy, in this Point, have but too "cloſely imitated the antient *Druids* *."

IT is now no longer a Wonder why our Author took ſo much Pains to fix an Accuſation upon theſe *Pagans*, who could give him no juſt Offence. He has brought *Cæſar* and *Pliny* to ſupport his Charge, neither of whom ſaith one Word to that Purpoſe. It appears therefore,

* Introduction.

that

that this was, ſtrictly ſpeaking, an Introduction: An Introduction to the expoſing the Chriſtian Religion, by expoſing thoſe that are entruſted with its Powers.

If the *Druids* had really been guilty of Prieſtcraft, is Chriſtianity founded upon Paganiſm? Are we to learn from hence, that there can be no Prieſthood without Uſurpation? The *Rapiners* would have a Religion without a Prieſthood; a Court without Judges; an Army without Officers.

A Power in Spirituals is conſiſtent enough with Obedience in Temporals, as they run in different Channels. Nor will it be alledg'd, that this Power has never been abus'd; that it is not as liable to be abus'd as any other Power: Yet that is not a Reaſon for introducing Anarchy.

Here is a Charge upon the whole Chriſtian Prieſthood, not determin'd to any particular Age or Nation. Here's no room to excuſe even Apoſtles, Martyrs, or Confeſſors, all are included. If Excommunication be the Thing on which the Charge is founded, the Apoſtolical Age was as criminal as any. Is it at laſt a Reflection upon the Guardians of the Church, that they excluded from being Members thoſe who were guilty of Diſobedience or Contempt? Do not all Societies the ſame, unleſs they have a Deſign to deſtroy themſelves?

Might we not have expected ſome Proofs upon this Charge? That it was the Principle or the Practice of the Clergy in all Ages and in all Nations, to proſtitute the Uſefulneſs of their Function to ſiniſter Views? This Author is above inſtancing in Time and Place. One is not anſwerable for the Faults of another. Nor would

would it affect Chriſtianity in general, if Exceptions were admitted.

We have a Flirt at the *Sticklers for the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy*; * Hiſtory, it ſeems, admits a Practice of Biſhops being ſubject to the Abbots of a Monaſtery founded by *Columba*. Are the Defenders of the Hierarchy confuted by ſuch a Stickler as this? Where's the Beauty of this Tautology, *Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy*? Unleſs it be to avoid offending the States, who deprive their Clergy, by ſending a Staff and a Pair of Shoes?

The Compliance of *Coifi*, called in this Hiſtory the Pagan High-Prieſt, * with King *Edwyn*, produces a valuable Remark: "*Coifi* perceiving the King was very near turning *Chriſtian*, reſolv'd with himſelf to make his Court to him betimes, by conforming to his Will. It would not, perhaps, be impoſſible to find ſome of this Character amongſt the Chriſtian Clergy."

Here's Room, it ſeems, for ſome of the Clergy to turn Chriſtian, or Danger of their turning Pagan, if they could find their Account in it. It's pity he has not more particularly explain'd himſelf, and juſtified the Freedom he takes; of which others will ſay,

Non Dii, non Homines, non conceſſere Columnæ.
Hor.

‡ "The Parliament of *England*, conſiſting of a King and Two Houſes, which repreſent the whole Nation, obliges every *Engliſhman* to a Submiſſion to its Statutes, for this Rea-

* Page 43. ‡ *Rapin* on *Eliz.* Page 254.

"ſon,

" ſon, if there were no other, that every Man " is ſuppos'd to have given his Conſent to their " Statutes, either in his own Perſon or that of " his Repreſentative. "

THIS ſeems to me one of thoſe Sentences which the chief Architect of *Rapin's* Hiſtory has thrown in for the Support of Dear *Original Contract*. Such a Sentence it is as one could hardly expect to find, after ſo particular an Account of Kings and Parliaments as our Author has given us. *Rapin*, perhaps, is not chargeable with this, ſo very different from the Government or Conſtitution of which he has been treating. But as we find it in the Body of his Hiſtory, he muſt bear the Blame of it, unleſs he had told us that he was but an Under-workman, to furniſh out a Relation of Facts, as near as he could, to give Strength and Colour to Anarchy, or to a Republican Scheme.

HOW does the Parliament conſiſt of a King and Two Houſes? Doth not the King call the Parliament? Is he not a King when he has no Parliament? What if he cannot enact Laws without a Parliament: Doth it thence follow that his Perſon has no Being but when he is in the Houſe of Lords?

WHO is it that the King repreſents in Parliament? Doth he repreſent himſelf? Whom do the Lords repreſent? Do they repreſent themſelves too? And how is the whole Nation repreſented by King, Lords, and Commons? The Lords ſit in their own Right. The Commons are elected by Virtue of the King's Summons; the Knights by the Freeholders who have forty Shillings a Year; the Burgeſſes from Cities and Towns whoſe Privilege it is to ſend them. But how is every Man ſuppos'd to have

choſen theſe, and conſequently to have given Conſent to their Statutes? How many Men are there Copy-holders? How many more Men that have neither Copy-holds nor Free-holds? A hundred Times as many, if not a thouſand Times as many as thoſe that have a Right of Voting.

Is it not enough to ſay, that every *Engliſhman* is oblig'd to ſubmit to the Statutes of the Realm, whether himſelf is particularly repreſented there or not? Whether he has a Vote for a Repreſentative or not? If the Conſtitution be ſuch, what has an Hiſtorian to do to repreſent it otherwiſe than it is? To lay that down for Law, which manifeſtly is contrary to Law?

We have had ſome grave Politicians a few Years ago advancing, that the King is one of the three *States of the Realm*, becauſe they could find but two beſides him; not knowing that the Lords Spiritual and Temporal make two of thoſe *States*. This will appear from the Act of Parliament appointing the Fifth of *November* to be obſerv'd as a Thankſgiving-Day, "For the happy Deliverance of King *James* I. "and the three States of *England*, from the "moſt traiterous and bloody intended Maſſacre "by Gunpowder."

What doth this Author mean by, "If "there were no other?" Every *Engliſhman* is bound to Submiſſion to the Statutes, becauſe he ſent up one to the making them, *If there were no other* Reaſon for his Submiſſion! That which he gives for a Reaſon, is no Reaſon at all, becauſe it is founded upon a Falſhood. The other Reaſons all put together muſt come to this, that it is according to the Municipal Laws

Laws of the Realm. His Submiſſion is due, becauſe 'tis demanded by the Law of his Country. What Room is there for this trifling upon a Man's being repreſented, and giving his Conſent, where it never was nor needed to be asked of him.

We have another Caſt of his Office *, upon the Pope's offering Queen *Elizabeth* to repeal the Divorce of *Henry* with *Ann Boleyn*, and of the Act of Parliament made in Conſequence of it. He tells us himſelf, that it was but *pretended*, that the Nuncio had a Power to offer this: Yet concludes, "One may obſerve from "this, what Opinion the Court of *Rome*, and "all Catholicks, had of *Elizabeth*'s Birth, ſince "it was made a Favour to own her for the Le-"gitimate Daughter of *Henry* VIII.

Of what Importance is it to a Perſon entitled to a Crown, whether ſuch a one, or ſuch a one, owns it, who has an Intereſt in refuſing to own it? Doth it make her Title better or worſe, that one may be bribed by Intereſt to own what another upon the ſame footing will deny? He muſt be a quicker-ſighted Politician than ſome of his Readers, if he can find out any thing in this. If her Title was juſtifiable, it was no Favour to own it, though it might be call'd a Favour. If it was not to be juſtified, it was the greater Favour to own it. And he that own'd what was not right, expected, perhaps, the greater Bribe for doing it. But does this alter the Nature of Right and Wrong? 'Tis the Perquiſite of Diſpenſing Power to turn Wrong into Right, and again

* Page 278.

Right into Wrong, though the former is generally at the better Price.

THIS Man has a Genius to Politicks, and it's become his Trade. When he harangues the leathern Aprons till he ſleeps over his Pipe, All is ſtill edifying! He is a Pope too in his turn. Every thing wants his Sanction, or it muſt fall to the Ground. Happy Monarchs! who muſt be recogniz'd from *Grubſtreet*, or be excluded from the Privilege of their Birth. Mighty *Grubſtreet!* who art the *dernier Reſort* of Title!

WHATEVER Hiſtorians this Writer has taken from, he has either made very free with them, or they very free with the *Engliſh* Conſtitution, when they inform'd him ‡, "The "Combination was ſo ſtrong in the Upper "Houſe, that ſome of the Lords were of Opi-"nion, that it was not ſufficient to entreat the "Queen, but that ſhe ought to be obliged to "marry, and in Caſe of Refuſal, a Succeſſor "ſhould be declar'd by Act of Parliament, "even againſt the Queen's Will."

WHAT ſort of an Act of Parliament was that, which could have been made without the Queen? The Lords and Commons might have Addreſſed, they might have Remonſtrated, they might have refus'd her Money, if ſhe would not marry. But how would any or all of theſe three have been an Act of Parliament, without the Queen's giving the Authority to it? If they had Power to make an Act declaring her Succeſſor againſt her Will, they had ſurely Power to make her marry againſt her Will. Was it for want of knowing our Lan-

‡ Page 320.

guage

guage in which our Hiſtories are written? Or from Inclination to the Good Old Cauſe of placing the entire Power in the People?

RAPIN takes upon himſelf the Office of a Comptroller in Hiſtory. In the Affairs of *Scotland*, he ſeems to be engaged *pro Aris & Focis*, ſomething farther than a diſtant Reader, indeed, than a well-feed Council. He has either fallen into ſome partial Hiſtory of thoſe Times at firſt, which prejudic'd him in its Favour, or has had ſome Volunteer of that Nation, who has laid about him ſtrenuouſly. He pretends to have ſtrictly examin'd *Buchanan* and *Melvil*, and from their Authority claims a Right to abuſe our Countryman *Cambden*, whom he accuſes of very indirect Practices, and upon whom he beſtows many angry Epithets not worth repeating. Mr. *Cambden* hath on this ſide *Tweed*, paſs'd for an Author both of Judgment and Integrity. And it would be carrying Politeneſs too far, to give him up at Mr. *Rapin*'s Demand.

CAMBDEN writes like a Gentleman, unwilling to expoſe Royal Failings farther than is neceſſary to let us into the Knowledge of the Springs of Action. *Buchanan* *, according to *Rapin*, "deſign'd to blacken *Mary*'s Reputation." Their Language is as different as generally that of a *Japanner* of Shoes compar'd with the other that employs him. Muſt a Man be call'd a Concealer of Truth, a Forger of Lies, and the like, becauſe he does not blazon every bad Action to the Good-liking of the Vicious and the Envious? Muſt he, when he meets with Frailties, indeed premeditated Crimes,

* Page 347.

entertain

entertain his Reader with the aggravating Circumſtances, as if he were pleading at Bar to get Damages for his Client?

UPON theſe two Authors, *Buchanan* and *Cambden*, our judicious *Rapin* is pleas'd to determine. The firſt carries the Cauſe, the other pays Coſts. His principal Evidence is *Melvil* to ſupport *Buchanan*. * "*Melvil*, on his Part, "has drawn in his Memoirs a Character of "*Buchanan*; which, though it does Juſtice to "his Senſe and great Knowledge, gives no "very advantageous Idea of the Qualities of "his Mind."

WHAT is it that can take off from a Man's Character more than to reflect upon the Qualities of his Mind?

UPON the Conduct of Queen *Elizabeth*, we have this: ‡ "*Mary* herſelf was for a "good while deceiv'd by this Policy. She "imagin'd *Elizabeth* really intended to ſerve "her. But diſcovering the Artifice at laſt, "ſhe reſolv'd to take ſuch Meaſures as fur-"niſh'd her Enemy with a plauſible Handle "to detain her in Priſon. I will venture to "affirm, that this is the true Key of the Af-"fair, which will never be rightly underſtood, "if we ſtand to what is ſaid by the Hiſtorians "of either Side."

EVERY Body elſe can collect this from the *Hiſtorians of either Side*. But where did Mr. *Rapin* find his Key, but from the Hiſtorians of one Side or of both? If this were a difficult Point of Hiſtory, as it is not, has Mr. *Rapin* a Key of his own making to unlock it. This

* Page 350. ‡ Page 383.

Sort

Sort of Keys he uſes too often. It is not for a Man's Reputation to have them found about him.

NOTWITHSTANDING his Diſtruſt of Hiſtorians of either Side, he promiſes to take *Buchanan* and *Melvil*; * "I think I cannot "be blam'd if I take the two firſt for Guides, "preferably to the laſt." Let it be remember'd, that of theſe two favourite Authors, the laſt, infinitely preferable to *Buchanan*, has call'd *Buchanan*'s Integrity in queſtion, as we have ſhewn.

I DARE even venture, as an Advocate for *Cambden*, to produce *Rapin*'s Evidence againſt him in his own Words, ſubmitting it whether that Evidence comes up to his Accuſation.

† "*CAMBDEN*, an *Engliſh* Author and "Proteſtant, wrote the Annals of the Reign "of Queen *Elizabeth*, in the Time of *James* I. "Son of Queen *Mary*. He was eminent for "his Knowledge in the Antiquities of *Eng-* "*land*, and, if I miſtake not, he was (*Claren-* "*cieux*) King at Arms. The Hiſtory of *Eng-* "*land* is indebted to him for ſeveral good "Works, which have given great Light to it. "But it manifeſtly appears, that in writing "the Annals of *Elizabeth*, his only Aim was "to vindicate the Queen of *Scots*, under Co- "lour, that there is no writing the Hiſtory of "*Elizabeth*, without a particular Account of "the Affairs of *Scotland*. He ſpeaks extream- "ly well of *Elizabeth*, when *Mary* is not con- "cern'd: But in the Places where the two "Queens muſt be neceſſarily put in Oppoſition,

* Page 351. † Page 446.

"he

" he does it ſo dextrouſly, that he gives to " underſtand, that *Elizabeth* was in the wrong. " The Caſe is not the ſame in Places where he " can praiſe or excuſe *Mary*, without blemiſh- " ing *Elizabeth*; for then he makes no Scru- " ple to ſet out the former as a Pattern of " Virtue. He entirely paſſes over in Silence " whatever may injure her Reputation; or " contents himſelf with confuting all that ſhe " is accuſed of, by a bare and directly op- " poſite Narration, without alledging the leaſt " Proof. So when a Man reads the Hiſtories " of *Cambden* and *Buchanan*, he would think " theſe two Writers are ſpeaking of two diffe- " rent Queens, who reign'd at the ſame Time " in *Scotland*. *Buchanan*'s Deſign was to " *blacken Mary*'s Reputation; and *Cambden*'s " to vindicate or praiſe her throughout. " Wherefore *Cambden*, who wrote laſt, has " taken Care to warn his Readers, that no " Credit is to be given to *Buchanan*, becauſe " he was the Earl of *Murray*'s Creature, a " mercenary Writer, and his Works condemn'd " by the States of *Scotland*. Nay, he pre- " tends, that before his Death he repented of " his Malice: But, according to his uſual " Way, he ſupports what he advances with no " Proof, neither does he take up *Buchanan* in " any remarkable Circumſtance, only, as I " ſaid, by giving a contrary Account." Having thus remov'd the Credit of the *Scotch* Hiſtorian, he adds, For his Part he propoſes, " to the End both Sides may be heard, to " relate the Affair (the King's Murther) with- " out any Mixture of Love or Hate, as far as " he can come to the Knowledge of it from " Writings, which were publiſh'd at the very

" Time,

" Time, but ſoon ſuppreſs'd in favour to the " Earl of *Murray*, and in hatred to the Queen, " or from Letters of Ambaſſadors, and of " other Perſons worthy of Credit. "

CAMDEN *has not alledged the leaſt Proof! He takes up* Buchanan *in no remarkable Circumſtance!* This is a *Rapinade.* I deſire to know whether *Buchanan*'s Works being condemn'd by the States of *Scotland*, does not amount to a *little* Proof? Whether that be not a Circumſtance *ſomething* remarkable? I do not undertake to juſtify Acts of State at all Times, and in all Places: Yet 'tis a hard Caſe, if an Act of State may not be ſet againſt one ſingle Evidence: Againſt ſuch a ſingle Evidence as *Camden*, one of *Rapin*'s three Writers, has publickly condemn'd: Againſt ſuch a ſingle Evidence as *Melvil*, his other Support, has charg'd with Inſincerity, if that be the Meaning of, *giving no advantageous Idea of the Qualities of his Mind?*

AND where, if I may be ſo bold, has *Camden* ſet out the Queen of *Scots*, as a *Pattern of Virtue?* He has, indeed, in his *Britannia*, ſhew'd his Abhorrence of Queen *Elizabeth*'s bringing her to the Scaffold. But, inſtead of loading her with accumulated Crimes, he has drawn a Veil over the Action as decently as a Man could do that would not approve it. He has palliated the Fault, by charging it in Part upon others Counſel. And here was the Place where he might have ſhew'd his Partiality, if he had been ſo inclin'd. It was doubtleſs an inhoſpitable and a barbarous Act. Yet the Excuſes generally offer'd to clear Queen *Elizabeth* from the moſt aggravating Circumſtances, have ſeldom met with a fair Hearing:

So much is Mankind biaſs'd by cruel Treatment; ſo much inclin'd to favour the Sufferer. It is barbarous to treat Queen *Elizabeth*'s Memory with the vulgar Scandal, that ſhe envied *Mary* for her Beauty, ſince the Uſe of Beauty is but to captivate the other Sex: And what View of that kind could the *Engliſh* Queen have, in which ſhe ſtood in Awe of the other as a Rival?

WITHOUT pretending to *Rapin*'s Maſter-Key, that opens the Secrets of every Breaſt, from the Actions of this Princeſs, taken all together, this Conjecture may be allow'd ſome Probability: That jealous as ſhe was of *Mary*'s claiming againſt her whilſt alive, and depending upon her ſucceeding, ſhe fear'd the Church of *England* would be once more over-turn'd by a Popiſh Queen; and all the Labour loſt that had been beſtow'd in throwing off the Pope's uſurp'd Temporal Power, with the Innovations Popery had fix'd here, the Super-additions to primitive Religion.

I AM far from thinking, and I believe was Mr. *Camden*, that Religion is to be ſupported by unlawful Means. When it can no longer ſtand by juſtifiable Endeavours, it is not the Will of God that we ſhould break one Law to maintain another. It is not out of the Power of Providence to ſupport what Miracle has founded. Nor is it the Part of Man, to determine what Proofs and Trials ſhall be exacted of his Obedience.

Tantum Religio potuit ſuadere—— Lucret.

has been ever an Atheiſtical Weapon to annoy and expoſe Firmneſs and Zeal. And though *Malorum* be added, it has been with Deſign to make

make all Bad who took the Part of Duty againſt Convenience.

In this, no doubt, Queen *Elizabeth* err'd. But let thoſe lay their Hand on their Mouth, who juſtify every Action by its End. And if all the Queen's Accuſers were to quit the Place, who were not clear of the Crime objected, in Act, Wiſhes, or Approbation, the Action, tho' in itſelf deteſtable, would not meet with ſuch a Crowd of Oppoſers.

WHEN a Man, ſaith he, *reads the Hiſtories of* Camden *and* Buchanan, *he would think theſe two Writers are ſpeaking of two different Queens, who reign'd at the ſame Time in* Scotland. Read *Brady* and *Tyrell*, *Oates* and *L'Eſtrange*, *Drake* and *Tuchin*, *Wharton* and *Burnet*, you ſee the very ſame Thing. It is not ſo rare as the Appearance of a Comet, to have the very ſame Perſon differently preſented. The one puts him on Lace and Embroidery, the other ſtrips him to his Shirt, or as much as would be the Hangman's Perquiſite, and he's the very ſame ſtill.

This very Change may be brought about ſometimes by the very ſame Hand. The ſhrewd Doctor *Davenant*, as he was ſtiled, could dreſs and undreſs. He could execute one Part, whilſt a *Black-Liſt Man*, and *Pouſſineer*, the contrary, when he became an *Under-Spur-Leather* to keep others in their Place.

Principles, like Towns, are won and loſt: They ſubmit to the Fortune of War, and muſt take their Chance for Approvers. Sometimes they bear a great while battering and ſtarving. Again they capitulate through Cowardice, or deſert for Reward. The Deſcription of the Siege is according to the Side that writes: The Aſſailants were brave, the Beſieged

obſtinate, and *vice verſâ*, upon which Side the Exchange is higheſt.

CEASE your Wonder, Dear Mr. *Rapin*, and let the World be govern'd by Intereſt, without throwing yourſelf into the diſmal State of Deſpair, becauſe every Man is not inclin'd alike to vend ſtinking Fiſh, or alike paid for doing it.

THE Bottom of this Charge upon *Camden*, if I have any Skill in the Stars, is, that he cannot pronounce the *Shibboleth*, and curſe the Race of *Stuarts*.

Hinc illæ Lacrymæ ——— Virg.

LET their Miſmanagements be what they are; the beſt paid *Swiſs* and Mercenaries have not yet been able to obliterate, ſo much as to ſully, the grateful Remembrance of them in diſintereſted Breaſts. Who has been above Envy and Slander? Who but they that have merited Eſteem and Applauſe, are Objects of detracting and malevolent Pens? The reſt are of a Side; and they need fear no ill Uſage from ill Men. Goodneſs itſelf has been arraign'd for Correſpondence with the Devil, and the Devil, by his Agents, the Accuſer.

WHO is there upon Earth free from Defects, indeed, who free from Faults? But are theſe to be given as the Portraiture of the Man? As well might Infants be expected to carry Burthens, or Age be reflected upon for Inactivity, as Human Nature be requir'd to be compleatly Wiſe and Succeſsful. For Want of Succeſs goes with us for Want of Wiſdom, and no Allowances made for what's unavoidable. 'Tis barbarous, 'tis diabolical, to ſingle out Spots and Wrinkles to deſcribe Men by, who have ſo many

many juſt Features to be admir'd. Let it ever be remember'd, that the higher the Station, the more in Number muſt be the Faults. He that paſſes his Life in Retirement and Obſcurity, gives fewer Occaſions to Cenſure and Miſrepreſentation, than another who is to act upon a publick Stage. Here's the Craft of Enemies, with the corrupt and ill-deſigning Counſel of Friends to guard againſt. If his Path be upon Ice, he may be excus'd for ſlipping. 'Tis unmanly to charge the Unfortunate perpetually with Crimes. Can a Pilot prevent a Storm? Is he anſwerable for the Inconſtancy of Wind and Weather? What is it that People would have, who deſcribe every Thing by its Blemiſhes, concealing the valuable Qualities? Should Original Contract extend itſelf to ſome new Province, the Man that is hired to govern would be ſick of his Preferment, if he reads the Lives of Kings written by Republicans. Enemies to a Crown, will be Enemies to him that wears it. A preſent Intereſt or Expectation, drives the Projector back for Ages to cenſure and unravel the Actions of the Dead, for a Pretence to carry on his Schemes and Conceits. By his falling ſo foul upon the Memory of the beſt, 'tis manifeſt, not the Man but his Office is ſtruck at. There are ſurely Degrees of Miſmanagement, yet we find amongſt Republicans no Allowances made. All the Virtues by which the beſt have ſignaliz'd themſelves, are ſmother'd and obliterated, by a detail of their Imperfections. A Compariſon of this affronted Race with thoſe that went before them, were enough to ſilence Libellers, if Gratitude and Juſtice had any Place left. To bring

a falſe

a falſe Accuſation, and tempt others to carry it on, is a Practice moſt deteſtable.

If I repeat ſome of *Rapin's* Charges upon *Camden*, and compare them with *Rapin's* own Reflections, it will appear that he has juſtified *Camden* where he went about to condemn him; ſo ludicrous do ſome Writers ſhew themſelves. † "But it is a ſad thing theſe Particulars muſt be taken from the Annals of *Elizabeth* written by *Camden*, a very ſuſpicious Author with reſpect to the Queen of *Scots*." By a *ſuſpicious Author* we are to underſtand, I preſume, an Author fit to be ſuſpected.

* "As there are no better Memoirs, we are forc'd, as it were, to take it for granted that all he ſays is true."

‡ "But *Camden's* Aim is to inſinuate, that *Elizabeth* was convinc'd of *Mary's* Innocence, and that it was that which diſtracted her Thoughts."

CAMDEN, whoſe Aim was not to vindicate *Elizabeth* in any thing relating to the Queen of *Scots*, inſerted in his Annals an Apology, which *Daviſon*, being in Priſon, ſent to Secretary *Walſingham*, ‖ and leaves his Readers to give their Judgment about it, without making himſelf any Remarks."

How are theſe Things to be vindicated? Or how has *Rapin* vindicated them?

** "In ſhort, with what Intent did *Elizabeth* tell the Parliament, That ſhe knew for certain, ſome had bound themſelves by an Oath to kill her within a Month? Was it

† Vol. IX. p. 64. * Page 85. ‡ Page 105.
‖ Page 112. ** Page 95.

"not

" not in order to incite the two Houſes to pre-
" vent this Misfortune, by the ſpeedy Execu-
" tion of the Sentence given againſt *Mary*?
" All this ſhews, that her Aim was to get
" the Parliament to preſs her upon this Ac-
" count, that ſhe might in ſome Meaſure be
" juſtified to the World, by aſcribing the Exe-
" cution of the Sentenee to the Inſtance of the
" Parliament."

* " It will, perhaps, be thought ſtrange,
" that I am thus peremptory in a Thing ſo
" hard to be known as *Elizabeth*'s inmoſt
" Thoughts. But, in my Opinion, very evi-
" dent Proofs may be drawn both from her
" Actions and Words, that throughout this
" whole Buſineſs ſhe acted with a great deal of
" Diſſimulation."

‡ " We are now come at length to the laſt
" Act of the Tragedy, for ſo it may well be
" called with reſpect to the Queen of *Scots*,
" though with regard to *Elizabeth* in was a
" real Comedy, or at leaſt a Scene of Diſſimu-
" lation acted with ſo much Art, that it can
" hardly be conceiv'd how it could be carried
" to ſuch a Height."

Speaking of *Daviſon*'s Apology, he ſaith:
† " If this Apology be true, one cannot deſire
" a more convincing Proof of *Elizabeth*'s Diſ-
" ſimulation. The Point in Hand was not the
" Death of *Mary*, that was already determin'd,
" but the Manner of her Death. It appears,
" by the Writing above-mention'd, that *Eliza-*
" *beth* would have been glad, that the Queen
" of *Scots* two Keepers would have made her
" away, to the End that ſhe might have been

* Page 101. ‡ Page 105. † Page 112.

" able

" able to clear herſelf, which ſhe would not " have fail'd to do, by putting them both to " Death. "

THERE is one Thing, indeed, which *Rapin* offers in Vindication of this Act; but I am not *Apollo* enough to decide whether he is in Jeſt or Earneſt. * " We muſt therefore keep to " the Neceſſity ſhe was under of deſtroying " *Mary* in order to ſave herſelf, and juſtify her " by the natural Law of Self-preſervation, the " only one which can be pleaded in her " Favour. "

IS this to ſhew he has a Power of reverſing Right and Wrong? Or that a Perſon uſeful to the Community may claim a Juſtification for the worſt of his Actions? The End, with ſome People, is ſufficient to juſtify the Means. And too frequent Inſtances are to be met with of ſupporting a good Cauſe by deteſtable Methods. This would at once cancel our Obligations to Juſtice, if Self-Defence may be pleaded for an Aſſault, the Perſon aſſaulting making himſelf Judge of the Neceſſity.

WHEN Dangers are aggravated and Fears heighten'd, Human Nature is tempted to uſe unlawful Weapons. Unhappy is the State, ſo generally envied, where fatal, as it's call'd, Neceſſity draws Men into cowardly Reſolutions: Where they want the Skill or Firmneſs to take thoſe for Adviſers who would act upon Principle and Honour, rather than cultivate a ſordid Intereſt by humouring a vicious Inclination.

THE beſt way of palliating ſuch an Action, is by repenting of it. And we have Reaſon to

* Page 89.

believe,

believe, the Remorſe this Princeſs underwent for her's, was more corroding than had been the Fears which drew her into it.

THIS Author again * takes the Liberty, to which he has accuſtom'd himſelf, of reforming the *Engliſh* Hiſtory, and throwing in his *Eclairciſments*, where he has himſelf own'd he can have no Foundation. Upon the Defeat, at leaſt Diſcouragements, the *Spaniſh Armada* met with in the Channel, they ſailed Northward, and there was ſome Apprehenſion of their being receiv'd into the Ports of *Scotland*. "Where-"upon the *Engliſh* Ambaſſador, who was then "at King *James*'s Court, made him large Of-"fers, and even paſs'd his Word for ſome "Things which he had not Power to promiſe, "and which were never made good." The Notes here expreſs the Offer: "*Aſhby*, the "Queen's Ambaſſador in *Scotland*, made "King *James* the following; namely, the "Title of a Duke in *England*, a yearly Pen-"ſion of 3000 *l.* a Guard to be maintain'd at "the Queen's Charge, and ſome other Mat-"ters: Whether (ſays *Camden*) of his own "Head, or by Command of others, I cannot "tell." *Camden.*

HERE's a poſitive Affirmation that the Am-baſſador "paſs'd his Word for ſome Things "which he had not Power to promiſe." He had before ſaid of *Camden*, ‡ "As there are "no better Memoirs, we are forc'd, as it were, "to take it for granted that all he ſaith is "true." This is upon the Queen of *Scots* Trial at *Fotheringay*.

* Page 127. ‡ Page 85.

As he takes upon him to contradict *Camden* here, at leaſt to affirm what *Camden* himſelf is in Doubt of, why does he not produce his Vouchers? Nor are theſe Offers, ſpecified in *Camden*, ſuch very grand Things, but an Ambaſſador, by general Inſtructions, might be ſuppos'd to have Power of making. His Inſtructions were probably general, to be ſuited to the Exigency of Affairs, or to the Inclination of the King, who was to be ſounded as to what would be moſt agreeable.

And what if theſe Promiſes were never made good? How does this quick-ſighted Writer know but the King had an Equivalent, or that himſelf remitted the Debt upon ſome other Conſideration, as the better ſecuring of his Succeſſion?

So that here *Rapin*, with all his Friendſhip to *Elizabeth*, and all his Complaints againſt *Camden* for not doing her Juſtice where the Houſe of *Stuart* is concern'd, has ſtrain'd a Point to load the Queen with Non-performance of her Ambaſſador's Promiſes, when *Camden* himſelf queſtions whether he had any Command. It may be a Queſton too hard for Mr. *Rapin* to determine upon, how far a Sovereign is oblig'd to perform the Promiſe of an Ambaſſador. But if no more than theſe Things mention'd were promis'd, ſhe would ſurely have done it, to ſave her Honour, if the King had not been otherwiſe ſatisfied.

Again, he takes upon him to aſſert the Law of Nations, in which he is but ſlenderly inſtructed. He calls it *Barbarity* to put the *Spaniards* ſhipwreck'd in *Ireland* to the Sword and Halter. If it be not againſt the *Law of Nations*, it is not Barbarity.

The

THE Law of Nations protects Ambaſſadors, and the Law of Arms aſſures Priſoners of their Lives after Quarter given. But where does he find it, that Quarter is due by the Law of Nations? Himſelf has given a prudential Reaſon to defend the Execution. "Seven hundred "Soldiers and Mariners, who had eſcap'd to "Land in the King of *Scotland*'s Dominions, "were ſent over to the Duke of *Parma*, with "*Elizabeth*'s Conſent. But thoſe who were "ſhipwreck'd in *Ireland*, and caſt aſhore, were "all put to the Sword, or periſh'd by the "Hands of the Executioner; the Lord De-"puty, by whoſe Orders it was done, *fearing* "*they would ſide with the Rebels.* At leaſt "this was the Pretence made uſe of to excuſe "this Barbarity."

AND is not this at laſt Pretence enough, when the Pope was a Confederate in the War, that his Friends in *Ireland*, actually Rebels, were like to join the Priſoners in aſſerting his Right to diſpoſe of all the Kingdoms upon Earth? Had not this Apprehenſion been juſt, it would have been, indeed, againſt the Laws of Humanity, to have made the Subjects of *Spain* forfeit their Lives for obeying their King.

YET it may be obſerv'd, that in our late Wars, the Plea for Quarter ran generally in Favour of mercenary Troops. Theſe having no Share in the Quarrel, no Malice, were entitled to better Treatment from a Conqueror, than the Subjects of the Vanquiſh'd. But upon what Foundation is this? Have not the Subjects of a Prince, who are to follow him in his Wars, or are forc'd into the Service, who have no Right to judge of the Cauſe and the Provo-

cation, a better Title to Compaſſion, than ſuch as cut Throats for Hire, and lay Countries waſte for Pay? War, unleſs upon juſtifiable Grounds, is but licenc'd Rapine: And though ſometimes neceſſary and honourable, is to the *Swiſs* like voluntary Amputation; as if a Surgeon ſhould cut and diſmember, to pleaſe a cruel Spectator, whoſe Office is appointed but for Preſervation of the reſt.

THESE Mercenaries had Reaſon to expect the Treatment of Men in a Fireſhip. Therefore the *Cantons*, in their firſt trading with the King of *France*, pretended their Troops ſhould be employ'd only to defend his Towns, as the beſt Security againſt the Reſentment of a Conqueror.

THE next Caſt of *Rapin*'s Office is to load King *James* with being acceſſary to the Plot for which *Eſſex* ſuffer'd. This wild Project of *Eſſex*, the Growth of Pride and Revenge, might urge him and ſome other reſtleſs Spirits of his Creatures too: But is it to be imagin'd, that the King of *Scots* could enter into it, ſo manifeſtly againſt his Intereſt? The Queen of *England* was in her ſixty eighth Year. Would he hazard his Succeſſion, to come in a little before his Time? And when he had more Reaſon to believe the Earl would ſet up for himſelf, had the Deſign ſucceeded, more like to keep him out than the Queen?

DELENDA eſt Carthago. The Reputation of every Branch of the *Stuarts* is to be maſſacred to pleaſe Mr. *Rapin*'s Friends. The Virtues of that Race are the Eye-ſore to his Admirers. Therefore their Faults muſt be aggravated, and new ones invented.

WHAT

WHAT Proof does he bring of this ſenſeleſs Charge? Enough, indeed, for thoſe who thirſt for Royal Blood, but none for any Body elſe.

* "IN ſhort, the penitent Criminal made a "full Diſcharge of his Conſcience, and con- "ceal'd nothing of what he knew. *Eſſex*, ſaith "*Camden*, thought a verbal Confeſſion too "little; and therefore, being mov'd by the "diſmal Scene preſented to his Conſcience, by "the Perſon whom he choſe to guide it, he "deliver'd the ſame in Writing under his own "Hand, which his Enemies ſhewing to King "*James* ſome Time after, brought the Earl "and his Friends into great Diſeſteem with "that Prince. If King *James* had not been "concern'd in this Affair, one ſees no Reaſon "why the Declarations of the Earl of *Eſſex* "ſhould have made him forfeit his Eſteem. "But, in purſuance of the Earl's Project, the "Ambaſſadors of *Scotland* were in their Way "to *London*, and King *James* always ſpoke of "this Lord as of one who died a Martyr to "his Cauſe."

IT's a pretty Way of proving Things: *One ſees no Reaſon* why the Declarations of the Earl of *Eſſex* ſhould make him forfeit King *James*'s Eſteem, if he [the King] had not been concern'd in this Affair! Mr. *On* here takes very much upon him, as he has done upon other Occaſions. But doth *On dit*, or *One ſees no Reaſon*, come up to a Proof? There are a great many *Ones* that muſt hold this Hiſtory in Diſeſteem for its Author's trifling Charges, and his lame Support of them. This is mere Invention, if we judge him out of his own Mouth. *In purſuance of*

* Page 208.

the

the Earl's Project, the Ambaſſadors of Scotland *were in their Way to* London.

LET us ſee now what the Earl's *Project* was, and we ſhall ſoon judge of *Rapin's Project*: For he is a Projector, eminently ſuch. The Earl had two *Projects*: And, by *Rapin's* Logick, if you bring the King into one, you may, by Slight of Hand, bring him into both. He had one Project to execute himſelf, ſecuring the Queen's Perſon, if not dethroning her. In order to make this eaſier, he frightens the King with Deſigns to ſet aſide his Succeſſion in Favour of the *Infanta*, and adviſes him to ſend an Ambaſſy, to have his Title aſſerted. * "It "was known that he had wrote to that Prince, "That a Plot was forming to deprive him of "the Succeſſion, and to place the Crown upon "the Head of the *Infanta* of *Spain*: That for "this Purpoſe the Projectors, who were all "powerful at Court, had filled the moſt con-"ſiderable Poſts with Perſons devoted to the "*Infanta*: That Secretary *Cecil*, Son of the "late Treaſurer, was at the Head of this Party, "and had engag'd in it the Treaſurer *Buck-"hurſt*, and the Earl of *Nottingham*, the Lord "High-Admiral: That the better to execute "his Undertaking, he had committed the Care "of the Maritime Places to his Creatures, "when a Deſcent might moſt eaſily be made: "That the Queen ſunk ſo faſt, that ſhe was "incapable to act any Thing herſelf, but was "entirely in the Power of her Miniſters: That "he was therefore under an abſolute Neceſſity "to appear openly for the defeating this Con-"ſpiracy: That to this End, he was with all

* Page 201.

"Haſte

" Haſte to diſpatch Ambaſſadors to *England*,
" to demand a Settlement of the Succeſſion,
" and that his Enemies, Creatures and Pen-
" ſionaries of *Spain*, ſhould be remov'd from
" the Court and Council. At the ſame Time
" he furniſh'd him with Proofs, which the Am-
" baſſadors might make uſe of to diſcover the
" Truth of the Plot. Laſtly, he gave him to
" underſtand, that his Ambaſſadors ſhould be
" ſufficiently ſupported. *Camden*, who wrote
" in the Reign of *James* I. has not thought fit
" to let us know how theſe Propoſitions were
" receiv'd by that Prince: But it may be
" judg'd that they were not diſagreeable, ſince
" very ſoon after he ſent Ambaſſadors into
" *England*, who came too late."

THIS being the Proof, I deſire to ask any but a *Projector*, Whether there is one Syllable of Proof in it? Whether this brings the King into *Eſſex*'s Rebellion, or ſo much as the Approbation of it?

King James *always ſpoke of this Lord as of one who died a Martyr to his Cauſe.* This proceeds too upon *On dit*, or *One ſees no Reaſon to the contrary. One ſees very little Reaſon* to depend upon any of this Author's Hear-ſays. If the King was pleas'd with *Eſſex* for oppoſing the *Infanta*'s Pretenſions, it does not thence follow, unleſs upon better Evidence than Mr. *Rapin*, that he acknowledg'd him a Martyr for his Cauſe.

IF theſe Things are ſo plain to Mr. *Rapin*, they muſt certainly have been ſo to Queen *Elizabeth*, who had much the better Head of the two. And ſhe, far from retorting upon King *James*, gave his Ambaſſadors a kind Anſwer, when they congratulated her upon the Diſcovery

Diſcovery of the Plot. * "*Elizabeth*, with-
"out any Notice taken of what ſhe knew, an-
"ſwer'd, She receiv'd very kindly the King's
"Congratulation, and wiſh'd that no ſuch
"Deſigns might ever moleſt him in his King-
"dom."

EITHER then Queen *Elizabeth* was not a Woman of Spirit, or *Rapin* is not an Author of Credit. Such Bungling Performances as theſe, give *One* a very mean Opinion of the Projector.

THERE is one Thing more in the Life of this Queen worthy our Obſervation, which could not properly be mention'd before the Plot of *Eſſex*, becauſe one Part of it belongs to his Story.

† "ON the other Hand, ſhe could not en-
"dure the *Puritans*, looking upon them as ob-
"ſtinate People, who for very trifling Reaſons
"bred a Schiſm in the *Proteſtant* Church.
"Whilſt ſhe had any thing to fear from the
"Queen of *Scots*, *France*, and *Spain*, in a
"Word, as long as her Affairs remain'd in a
"Sort of Uncertainty, ſhe let the *Puritans*
"alone, for fear of uniting them in the ſame
"Intereſt with the *Catholicks*. But no ſooner
"was ſhe out of all Danger, but ſhe lent an
"Ear to the Suggeſtions of the Clergy, who
"repreſented the *Puritans* to her as ſeditious
"Perſons, who rebell'd againſt the Laws, and
"by their Diſobedience ſhook the Foundations
"of the Government. This was not the only
"Time, nor is *England* the only State where
"Diſobedience in Point of Religion, has been
"confounded with Rebellion againſt the Sove-

* Page 212. † Page 147.

reign.

" reign. There is ſcarce a *Chriſtian* State, " wherein the prevailing Sect will ſuffer the " leaſt Diviſion, or that any ſhould ſwerve " ever ſo little from the eſtabliſh'd Opinions, " no not even in private. *Shall I venture to* " *ſay it?* 'Tis the *Clergy* chiefly who ſupport " this ſtrange Principle of *Non-Toleration*, ſo " little agreeable to *Chriſtian Charity.*"

WHAT need of bringing in the Clergy's Influence, when the Queen had taught herſelf a Prejudice to the *Puritans? She could not endure the Puritans: She let the Puritans alone, for fear of uniting them in the ſame Intereſt with the Catholicks.* Then they were ready, according to Mr. *Rapin*, to join with Popery to deſtroy the Conſtitution. Was not this enough to make her *not endure them*, without any Inſtances of the Clergy?

THIS Writer puts *one* in Mind of the old Ordinary of *Newgate* confeſſing the Priſoners. He had two or three Points, one of which always introduc'd the Confeſſion. One he complain'd of, that he had tried him upon Sabbath-breaking, again upon Drinking, and afterwards upon Whoring, as the Habit that brought him into all the reſt. The Fellow denying that any of the three had been the Occaſion, he ſet him by and took the next, ſaying he could make nothing of him. Nor can Mr. *Rapin* ever make any thing of a Crime, if he hath not the *Clergy* to lay it upon. *Tantum Religio potuit*, ſtands firſt in his Common-place Book.

THE ſame Ordinary is remember'd for having bragg'd of a hundred and fifty Sermons he had by him of his own making; to which a Wag replied, He was an extravagant Mortal, to be ſo laviſh of his Learning; Four had been

enough, ſince his Congregation was hanged once a Month.

We have Mr. *Rapin* a hundred and fifty times coming up with this wonderful Diſcovery. Once might have ſerv'd. Nor is there, indeed, much Variety in the Charge, only ſaying the ſame Thing over again, and applying it to every Purpoſe. His *Ordinary* Compariſon of the *Druid* to the *Chriſtian* Prieſtcraft, (having firſt forg'd the Accuſation againſt the *Druids*) as we may find at his ſetting out, had been ſufficient; without the laborious Examination of all the Faults and Miſcarriages which Hiſtory affords us, I might have ſaid which Hiſtory makes.

SHALL I venture to ſay it? Behold the Orator! What, Mr. *Rapin* beginning to Venture! Has he not made Breaches enough, and mounted them with Gallantry enough, that he muſt, after ſo many glorious Campaigns, ſeem to queſtion his own Proweſs? I expected by this Time to ſee a Triumph decreed him by his twenty thouſand Admirers, every one of which can boaſt;

Vidi ego jactatas mutâ face creſcere flammas.
Ovid.

Our Author mentions, in the above-cited Account of the Queen's Averſion to the *Puritans*, what he has obſerv'd, and what he would have us obſerve; I cannot ſay whether in Jeſt or Earneſt. "This was not the only Time, "nor is *England* the only State, where Diſobe- "dience in Point of Religion, has been con- "founded with Rebellion againſt the Sove- "reign." Confounding, in one Senſe, is Compounding. So the Ingredients of an Electuary,

ary, or of a Pudding, are Confounded or Compounded, which Mr. *Rapin* pleaſes. He ſeems to give us the Word in the *Compound* Senſe *. " This Hiſtorian adds, that he *(Eſſex)* drew " into his Party ſome *Presbyterian* Miniſters, " and even ſome *Papiſts*, by commiſerating the " Hardſhips to which they were expos'd under " the Tyrannical Government of the Queen, " and in giving them Hopes of a Redreſs of " their Grievances. "

HERE ſeems to be a great Omiſſion, or *Hiatus valde deflendus*, in *Rapin*'s Copy; or a Sentence has been eras'd by ſome High-Church Corrector, importing, that the Clergy was at the Bottom of this Charge upon the *Presbyterians*.

† " This *Presbyterian* Miniſter *(Aſhton)* ad- " vis'd him to declare all he knew, and that it " was from this, probably, that the Part which " the King of *Scots* acted in this Conſpiracy " came to be known. "

HOW did it come to be known? Is it yet known by any Proof *Rapin* has given of it? He owns, the Earl declar'd all he knew. Since he has not declar'd that, Mr. *Rapin*, I preſume, has given us to underſtand that it is not true. It is well the Earl had not a Church-Confeſſor, for then he might have borne the Blame of concealing the Guilt of the King of *Scots*. *Rapin* acknowledges, from *Camden* ‡, " That the Earl deliver'd his Confeſſion in " Writing under his own Hand. " Doth *Camden*, who is the Authority, ſay any thing of the Earl's confeſſing the King's Guilt? Is not

* Page 201. † Page 207. ‡ Page 208.

the Confeſſion ſufficient to make *Eſſex* forfeit his Eſteem with the King for ſo vile an Attempt upon Majeſty, though the King himſelf was never made an Acceſſary.

Nil erit ulterius quod noſtris moribus addat
Poſteritas.——— Juven.

Mr. *Rapin* is extreamly fond of ſhewing his Skill in Titles. King *James*, he tells us, had a Leaſh of them, *Parliamentary*, *Hereditary*, and *Teſtamentary* *. It's much he forgot the *Elective* Right, to which he us'd to pay great Reſpect. But, perhaps, the *Elective* is comprehended in the *Parliamentary*, as he explains it, " which derives its Validity from the Act " of Parliament ſecuring the Crown to *Henry* " the Seventh and his Iſſue. " *Henry* the Seventh might think fit to accept what *Rapin* ſaith *they call in* England *Parliamentary Right*: But his Children deriving their Right from the Houſe of *York*, never valued themſelves upon the other, nor would they have thanked him for his Pains: His Diſtinctions will be abſorbed by the *Hereditary* Title, if we look at the firſt and laſt. For what had King *James* from Queen *Elizabeth*'s Will, but an Acknowledgement that he was the Lawful Succeſſor? It was not in her Power to appoint another; nor was ſuch a Power pretended to by her Father, but upon the Strength of an Act of Parliament. *Edward* the Sixth made a new Succeſſor by Will, but it was ſoon ſet aſide for the right Owner.

From the Samplar *Rapin* has given us of his Spite to the Race of *Stuarts*, we may ex-

* Page 227.

pect

pect now and then a Volunteer to expoſe them. I will not ſay he has no juſt Reaſons to condemn King *James* upon ſome Accounts: But the more Truth he has to ſay againſt him, the leſs Pretence he has to charge him with what is falſe. He may be contented with having real Crimes to inſult him for.

WHAT can be more incredible than the Accuſation of murthering his eldeſt Son *Henry*; a Youth againſt whom *Rapin* himſelf has only one *But* to offer, acknowledging in him a *Galaxy* of amiable Qualities and Endowments? Yet ſo unnatural an Action is recorded by this Renown'd Author, though upon the ſingle Evidence of *On dit*. He lugs in the Story with the Unwillingneſs of a Friend, yet is unwilling the Enemies of that illuſtrious Houſe ſhould be unacquainted with this Piece of Scandal. He doth not ask himſelf the old Queſtion, *Shall I venture to ſay it?* But in a Strain as truly Rhetorical; * "I paſs over in Silence a thou-"ſand Things ſaid upon this Occaſion, par-"ticularly what ſome Authors would inſinuate, "that the King caus'd him to be poiſon'd. In "ſuch a Caſe, the Proofs ought to be as clear "as the Sun; and I do not find in the Hiſto-"rians, who were moſt bitter againſt King "*James*, any thing but bare Suſpicions and "naked Conjectures, which in all Appearance "were only Fruits of the blackeſt Malice."

WHY then does he relate the Thing, if he could not give in to the Truth or Probability of it? Was it that it might ſuit ſome other Palate, if it was too nauſeous for his own? Or was it that he ſhould make more Dirt ſtick,

* Page 339.

than

than his demure Proteſtation could wipe off again?

"OTHERS are * contented with accuſing "the Viſcount *Rocheſter* of this Crime, but "without any Manner of Proof." Cannot a Man die without Poiſon? Or if he dies with it, is his Father the firſt to be ſuſpected?

AFTER telling us the Body was open'd in the Preſence of a great many Phyſicians and Surgeons, who declar'd upon Oath no Marks of Poiſon were to be ſeen; this candid Hiſtorian, ſo averſe to believe ill of Kings, throws in an Argument to ſupport the Credit of the Suſpicion. ‖ "But what reflected moſt upon "the King, was his commanding that no Per-"ſon ſhould appear at Court in Mourning."

HE takes off this again, after his uſual Moderation, in the next Words: "Whether he "was willing to remove all melancholy Objects "from his Sight that might renew his Con-"cern; or did not think proper to interrupt "the Diverſions which were prepar'd for his "Daughter's Marriage."

IT is true, not Mourning for his Son was indecent. It was alſo indecent not to Mourn for Queen *Elizabeth*. But muſt a Man acting indecently, be accus'd alſo of being a Murtherer and a *Cannibal*? The ſagacious Mr. *Rapin* might have deſcried in that a Foundation to preſume him Innocent, for the Guilty are moſt apt by ſuch Means to conceal their Crimes.

COKE's Words at the Trial of *Overbury*'s Murtherers, are to corroborate this unnatural Suſpicion: † *God knows what became of that*

* Page 339. ‖ Page 340. † Page 374.

ſweet

ſweet Babe Prince Henry, *But I know ſomewhat.*——This could only be meant of *Somerſet* and his Accomplices. It's ridiculous to imagine the Judge was accuſing the King.

But there's a ſecond Poiſoning thrown at him, in order, we may believe, to gain Credit for the firſt: That of *Arabella Stuart.* "This (ſaith our Author *) "is what ſome Hiſto-"rians have advanc'd, or at leaſt inſinuated." He has own'd *Weldon's* Performance to be a Satire. And as Painters are to make People handſomer and like, Satiriſts are to make them uglier and like.

Considering the Animoſities ſubſiſting againſt the King, and encreaſing againſt the Son his Succeſſor, it is no Wonder that a thouſand odious Pictures of them were drawn by Malice and approv'd by Reſentment. And when the moſt flagrant Parricide was committed upon *Charles* I. the Actors of that Tragedy, and thoſe who inherited their Plunder, invented or improved moſt monſtrous Barbarities to be imputed to them, that the Sufferer or his Family might appear as black as they that murthered him: And ſo the Matter was to be ſalved up with,

——*Nec Lex eſt juſtior ulla.* Ovid.

If every Thing that has found a Place in Satire and Paſquinade ſhould find one in Hiſtory too, to which we are advancing, Poſterity will be well encourag'd in a licentious Behaviour. If ſuch Accuſations as theſe of King *James*, had by any Means been brought upon the Publick Stage; aſſerted by any Priſoner upon his

* Page 378.

Trial,

3

Trial, though unjuſtly urg'd, there had been Room to record them. But as they are only the Flaſhes of Envy and Revenge, a Writer with clean Hands ought not to meddle with them. It muſt be allow'd by Friends and Enemies, that Repreſentation has exceeded Action: That Malice in ſetting Things forth, has vaſtly outdone the moſt profligate Actor.

It's a Sign the Uſefulneſs of Hiſtory is ſinking, when its Gravity is dropp'd: When Amuſement, and Table-talk, and Farce, are come in its Room; and Mankind juſtified in their Follies, rather than corrected by the Example of their Predeceſſors. To what End is this Trumpery of *Dutch* Pictures, ‡ and Alehouſe Chat, recorded, unleſs to extirpate Honour and Spirit; and to cultivate a Bear-garden Genius. 'Tis eaſy to put a Man into a Fool's Coat, and to give his Character from his Enemies. Mr. *Rapin* is ſo ingenuous as to give both Sides a Hearing, under Pretence of Impartiality, but never fails of deciding againſt Kings. He tags the End of King *James*'s Reign with a Bit of *French* Lampoon, that he may go off the Stage to Diſadvantage.

If we examine this great Cenſor, as he has taken upon him to examine Kings, his Judgment will appear as impertinent as any of the Actions he condemns. *The Pacifick Monarch!* Surely Peace and Quietneſs are preferable to Bloodſhed and Rapine. None but *Swiſs* and Plunderers ever took War to be ſo much as Lawful but when it was Neceſſary. What was the Benefit to the Subject when the Throne was fill'd with Men of Martial Spirit? When

‡ Page 504.

War

War was their Sport, was not the Nation drain'd of Blood and Money, to gain or ſupport Acquiſitions on the Continent? Were they not the Tools of Pride, Ambition, and Revenge? Could theſe Martial Men have obtain'd an entire Conqueſt of *France*, what would have been the End, but making *England* a Province, to be govern'd by a Deputy, in Subjection to the other? Were not the *Fleurs de Lys* preferr'd to the Lyons?

Some Advantages the Nation might loſe in Credit and in Intereſt from this Pacifick Temper. But ſuppoſing Mankind apt to run into Extremes, this might be the leſs Evil of the two. Much, indeed, may be attributed to his Natural Temper. But if his Subjects were in the main the better for this Blemiſh in him, they had no Reaſon to complain. His Son was of as Pacifick a Temper as himſelf, yet when dragg'd into the Field by Honour and Diſtreſs, none ſhew'd a clearer Courage, or a more manly Compaſſion. Yet in him, *(ſhall I venture to ſay it?)* no Martial Virtues are to be found by Men who make theſe the conſtituent Part of an Hero. His Gallantry ought to weigh with them, as his Generoſity does with fairer Judges: Yet, of the whole Race, this is the Man pick'd out for Odium and Contempt.

If any one King had left a perfect Pattern for the reſt, there would have been more Reaſon to expect that Pattern ſhould have been imitated. But when Republicans ſpeak of Kings, they cannot do it without ſuppoſing them made with the Perfection of Angels; and then every Deviation from ſo exalted a State, gives them the Horror they affect to ſhew.

FAVOURITISM has certainly been a Snare on one Side, as *Patriotiſm* has been on the other. 'Tis natural to pay Love for Love; to over-value Deſert and Fidelity.

On the other Hand, People have a kind of Averſion to be over-topp'd by their Equals, whom they envy even for ſuperior Endowments, not eaſily acknowledging them to be ſuch. Hence Fears and Jealouſies grow and are cultivated; the Family is divided, Children apprehending their Intereſt diſtinct from that of the Father.

Where *Prerogative* or *Patriotiſm* have been ſtrain'd too high, they have been the Deſtruction of themſelves; and, like an over-bent Bow, loſt all their Force. Either has given too much Scope to the other, which was a Check upon its Exceſſes, and fallen, by endeavouring to cruſh its Opponent. When Patriotiſm prevail'd, it was the Ruin of itſelf. The united Power, which drove down the other before it, hatch'd a Monſter more furious and deſtructive than that it undertook to quell. It produc'd the deſpotick Form it pretended to guard againſt, more deſpotick than they had pretended to fear; with the Addition of this Remorſe, that it was a Remedy of their own, unjuſtly ſought, which they own'd to be worſe than the Diſeaſe. And whatever be the Charm of Democracy to thoſe that have not tried it, 'tis enough to obſerve, that it ends in what it would avoid; and inſtead of a limited Superiority, ſubmits to an unbounded one.

When the Reins were got into the Hands of a ſingle Perſon, whether by Deluſion, Corruption, or Diviſion, it was all a Caſe, by avoiding one Rock they ſplit upon another.

Nor

Nor is it juſt in our Remarkers upon the Miſcarriages of Princes, to put them upon the Level with the Miſcarriages of Subjects. But the Prerogative of Writers would be above all Prerogative. The Act of a Body has the Advantage of more Heads to judge and deliberate, therefore an Error of theirs is leſs pardonable than in a ſingle one. A ſingle one, I call it, becauſe he muſt ſingly make a Judgment of his Counſels, or he is liable to be miſled by Men of contrary Views and Paſſions. *Charles* I. had the Modeſty and the Goodneſs to take Advice, yet 'tis generally admitted his own was better. Whatever wanted Succeſs or Approbation, was ever charg'd heavily upon him. Sometimes he was call'd Opinionative, that he might bear the whole Blame; ſometimes accus'd of giving himſelf up in a blind Submiſſion to others.

The Impartial Mr. *Rapin* begins with King *Charles*'s Character, and ſets him forth aiming at Tyranny, from the Leſſons and the Example of his Father. He might, in good Manners, firſt have given us the Text before he enter'd upon the Comment: But he aſſures us, he will make his Determination good by the Sequel. This is a new Way of Judging: But the Prerogative of Writers will, perhaps, look down upon ſuch an Objection as this with the Contempt it deſerves.

It muſt be ſaid for him, he gives his Readers as much Liberty as he takes himſelf; ſomething more than he has a Right to take or give. * "After that, he leaves the Readers to judge

* Preface to the Reign of *Charles* I.

" of the particular Actions, according to the " Principles they are pleas'd to adopt."

THIS ſame *adopting* of Principles is a new Syſtem, but may be of Uſe in ſolving ſome *Phænomena*. Principles have been hitherto underſtood, Rules of our Actions founded upon Truth, or upon the Appearance of Truth. How then is a Man at Liberty to *adopt* them? He may change Error for Truth, and Truth for Error; the firſt by better Information, the latter for want of Judgment. But ſtill, what is call'd Principle, carries with it the Evidence of Truth, according to the beſt of a Man's Underſtanding.

AND what at laſt has Principle to do in the judging of other Mens Actions? If he underſtands that 'tis the Principle of an honeſt Man to judge as he would be judged; to treat others with Candour, as he would expect the ſame Uſage: This is truly Principle. But how is this to be adopted? He may give a perverſe Turn to Mens Actions. He may conceal Truth and publiſh Falſhood; but this cannot be done out of Principle.

PERHAPS he meant no more than following his Inclination, or his Intereſt, to juſtify all the Actions of his Friends, and condemn all the Actions of his Enemies. But what has this to do with Principle? It is, indeed, a good Principle in an Army to ſuccour Friends and annoy Enemies: But neither is this at a Man's Choice, ſo as to be adopted.

IF by Principles he means Party, this is a pretty Way of ſetting Mankind to judge. A generous Hiſtorian would rather have made Allowance for Imperfections and Defects, for Paſſion and Prejudice; than have made it his Buſineſs,

Buſineſs, at ſuch a diſtant Time, to aggravate Misfortunes, and carry Error into Malice.

The People under *James* and *Charles* I. might have a Jealouſy, that theſe Princes were extending their Power to the Prejudice of Parliaments. But moſt of thoſe who had a real Jealouſy, had it infus'd into them by Men of Craft and Deſign. Theſe latter, out of Envy, Diſguſt, and ſuch-like Motives, blow'd up an ill-judging Set of Men into ill-grounded Fears. And, very probably, from reflecting upon the Sufferings of their Fore-fathers, under Princes who ſhew'd little Regard to the Great Charter of Liberties, to which they were moſt ſolemnly bound, they were tempted, when they liv'd under thoſe who had neither Inclination nor Power to oppreſs them, to clip the Prerogative ſo far, that it ſhould not be capable of hurting the People again, ſhould the Crown ever be upon the Head of one that might attempt it.

It was no Wonder that People ſhould be found, who would make a *Wreck* of the Prerogative, that every one might run away with his Share. It is well known, that the moſt reſtleſs Spirits, thoſe who had in former Parliaments made the chief Oppoſition to the King, and ſometimes merely for Oppoſition-ſake, had allur'd the Electors, under a Covert of Patriotiſm, and excluded Men of better Temper from repreſenting them.

The Prince had by this Time his Jealouſies too: And thought it his Intereſt to guard againſt the Invaſion of his Rights; believing Conceſſions would but introduce farther Conceſſions, and that he ſhould have no Royalty left, if he ſuffer'd it to be curtail'd at the Demand of Levellers.

If Mr. *Rapin's* Admirers have Room to adopt a Principle, I would recommend to them that of Juſtice. Then it will appear, that Redreſs of Grievances was not Petition'd for, but Commanded. Would it not have become the Parliament as well to repreſent their Grievances, and leave Majeſty to redreſs them before their next Meeting? There had been but one Tax thrown away, if they had never been redreſs'd at all. And it is much more probable the King would have found Methods to have made them eaſy, if he might have had the doing it himſelf. But for them to inſiſt upon the Puniſhment of his Servants, for acting by his Command, and for acting what there was no Law againſt, but Ill-Succeſs: For them to deny him the Power of a common Maſter, and to dictate Pains and Penalties which it was the Part of Majeſty to inflict, was claiming an Authority *Magna Charta* never gave.

What is there in this Prince's Behaviour, from Beginning to End, that will make an indifferent Perſon ſuſpect he had any private Views, oppoſite to the Welfare of his People? Had he Ambition, Pride, or Revenge, to miſlead him? Is he charg'd with Cruelty, Avarice, or an inſolent Uſe of Power? It was reſolv'd to pull him down, and afterwards to form his Accuſation.

He would not, indeed, bear to be told that he was *Servant to the People*, having not receiv'd his Authority from them. His Title being by Birth and Inheritance, he would not own himſelf their *Servant*, who were bound by the Law and their Allegiance to obey him. He was to adminiſter Juſtice to his Subjects at Home, to defend them from their Enemies Abroad

Abroad. This, in one Senſe, may be call'd doing *Service* to his People. So the Sun does *Service* to the Earth, but its Inhabitants may call it Beneficence. Is Gratitude to a Parent to be ſunk, becauſe 'tis his Duty to protect his Family? Is a Lord of a Manor *Servant* to his Copy-holders, becauſe he is to defend their Right of Commoning? When the Copy-holders preſent the Lord with an Eſtate, and acknowledge a Fine and Quit-Rent due to him for holding Courts, and keeping Hoſpitality, they will have ſomething to ſay: But if their Suit and Service is due to him by the ſame Law and Cuſtom that entitles them to their Lands; if he was born their *Maſter*, he will not bear to be call'd their *Servant*.

DID not Queen *Elizabeth* lay a Reſtraint upon the Houſe of Commons, when ſhe found them exceeding their Bounds? If we look at the Articles againſt *Buckingham*, of which the King offer'd to clear him, we ſhall find ſome of them brought in, as it were, for Form-ſake; to fill up a Number, and as a Body of Reſerve, to be led up, if the firſt ſhould be put to the rout.

ONE Charge is, * "Of procuring to his "Kindred and Allies, Titles of *Baron*, *Viſcount*, "*Earl*, without their having done the State "any Service."

WAS this Part of the Prerogative, that the Crown had Power of conferring Titles, ever queſtion'd till now? What is there in this but an Inſult upon the King? But a Deſign to make him contemptible to the Subject? It certainly takes off from the Credit of an Accu-

* Page 72.

ſation,

ſation, that any Part of it conſiſts in Trifles. If ſubſtantial Proof can be made, what Uſe is there of theſe? The Fact here, it's probable, might have been made good, which in other Points might have fail'd. Solemn Impeachments ought not to end like Ballads and Catches, with, *Or any other Reaſon why.*

THE Plaiſters and Potions King *James* had from the Duke, were fitter to be enquir'd after by his Succeſſor, than by his Commons. The Commons here ſhew'd more Regard to a dead King, than they had ſhew'd to him when alive.

JUST ſuch an Offence did the Chancellorſhip of *Cambridge* give theſe Patriots, who had already impeach'd the Duke for Plurality of Offices. Is there any Law againſt Plurality of Offices? Is there any Pretence that the Addition of this ſhould be a Grievance to the People? If it ſhew'd any thing, it ſhew'd a Spirit in the Univerſity, deteſting the Affronts daily put upon Majeſty, for managing his Family without the Direction of his Children and his Servants. It ſhew'd that Body determin'd to ſink in the Common Ruin, not juſtifying their Oppreſſors by ſervile Compliance; nor cutting themſelves off from Pity, when it was their turn to be devour'd.

RAPIN, with all his Profeſſions of Impartiality, ſhews himſelf at all Times of Council againſt the Court. The Affair of *Prynn* * is ſet forth as a moſt unreaſonable Proſecution. "In the Month of *February* 1634, came to a "ſolemn Hearing in the Star-Chamber, a "Cauſe which made a great Noiſe, and ſhew'd "the extreme Severity of that Court againſt

* Page 282.

"ſuch

" ſuch as were ſuſpected not to be ſubmiſſive " enough to the Government. Mr. *William* " *Prynn* (Barriſter of *Lincoln's-Inn*) had taken " into his Head to write a large Volume in " Folio, of above a thouſand Pages, entitled, " *Hiſtrio-Maſtix*. The Author's main Drift " was to ſhew, that *Stage-Plays*, *Balls*, *Maſques*, " were unlawful and Anti-chriſtian. But in " handling his Subject, he had interſpers'd " ſundry Reflections which might be applied " to the King, the Queen, the Church, who " approv'd or tolerated theſe Abuſes. It was " pretended, his Aim, in general, was to make " appear, that there was a Deſign form'd to " reduce Religion to a kind of *Paganiſm*, in " order to make Way for *Popery*. "

If we look at this Author's Relation of the Fact, without the heavier Charge others give it, doth this Impudence of *Prynn* allow him a Place amongſt *ſuch as were ſuſpected not to be ſubmiſſive enough to the Government?* So notorious an *Overt-Act* as this makes him but a *ſuſpected* Perſon! He is ſuſpected of not being *ſubmiſſive enough to the Government*, who has, in the moſt barefac'd Manner, vilified and affronted Majeſty!

Let every Thing go by its proper Name. Let your Hiſtory, Mr. *Rapin*, be call'd a Satire upon Kings; an Help to Nurſery Chat, where our Children are to be inſtructed in Rebellion to God and his Vicegerents.

IT was pretended, his Aim, in general, was to make appear, that there was a Deſign form'd to reduce Religion *to a ſort of* Paganiſm, *in order to make Way for* Popery.

Who but a Man of Mr. *Rapin's* Front would repeat ſo ſenſeleſs a Slander, as King

Charles's Inclination to *Paganiſm*? *Popery* he has been loudly charg'd with, becauſe he would not come in to the Deformities of the Reforming *Puritans*: Becauſe he would not baniſh the Hierarchy, to ſhew an Averſion to *Popery*, in which *Popery* was in the Right. The Surplice was a Point of *Popery*, and what if it was? Kneeling at the Communion was Popery, was it therefore not a proper Poſture of Devotion? Whither would theſe Wiſe Heads lead us, but to condemning the Innocent with the Guilty, reforming from Truth as well as from Error?

Did King *Charles* by his Practice and Example encourage *Paganiſm*? Did he chuſe thoſe to be about him who were abandon'd to Vice and Immorality? Did he not keep up, both in Private and in Publick, the ſtricteſt Regard to Virtue and Religion? Or when was ſuch a Regard kept up? Theſe are Heroes in Malice, who attack the King in the ſtrongeſt of his Entrenchments; and to make good the Charge of Arbitrary Deſigns, accuſe him of that Deſign againſt the Church of *England*, of which his whole Life and Death is a moſt manifeſt Refutation.

Mr. *Rapin*, to aggravate King *Charles*'s Avarice, has thought fit to ſet forth the Crown-Revenues in the following Manner; and pronounces them to be ſufficient for him, even what was remaining at the Time he wrote.

‡ "One may venture to ſay, that no Prince in "*Europe* equals in Riches a King of *England*, "who knows how to make himſelf belov'd by "his Subjects. *Not only his ordinary Revenues*

‡ Page 246.

"*are*

" *are more than ſufficient to enable him to keep a* " *ſplendid and magnificent Court, provided they* " *are manag'd with never ſo little Care: But* " *it is properly the Sovereign alone who has* " *never any Occaſion to heap up Money againſt* " *what may happen.*"

ONE would think this Hiſtory compil'd by ſeveral Men who had taken their Parts to perform, and had never ſeen one another's Works. What does this great Author mean, by ſaying, upon King *Charles*'s ſummoning the Nobility to attend him at *York* with as many Horſe as they could raiſe, that this was not an uſual Demand of Kings. * He tells us, " there were Crown-" Lands, the Poſſeſſors whereof were oblig'd to " find the King Troops, according to the Fron-" tiers that were like to be invaded." It's true, Lands were given near *Scotland* and the Marches of *Wales*, for the Owners to be always ready. But was not every Man oblig'd for as many Knights-Fees as he had, to attend the King with ſo many Followers againſt the *Scots* or *Welſh*, or in his Wars upon the Continent? Were not all the Lay-Eſtates in *England* held by this Tenure? What will he make of thoſe many Inſtances himſelf has given of the Kings aſſembling Armies that Way? What of *Bigod*, who, when the King ſwore he ſhould March or be Hanged, ſwore again, he would neither March nor be Hanged?

MR. *Rapin*, in his Cenſure of *Engliſh* Writers, introducing his Eleventh Volume, is pleas'd to determine, that the War brought by the Subject againſt *Charles* I. was not Rebellion, becauſe he aim'd at an unlimited Power. ‡ " I

* Page 367. ‡ Vol. XI. p. 5.

" ſhall not ſpeak here of a great many leſs con-
" ſiderable Writings, which for the moſt Part
" aſcribe to the King an unlimited Power, and
" conſequently repreſent the laſt War of the
" Parliament againſt *Charles* I. as the blackeſt
" and moſt palpable Rebellion. "

THESE leſs conſiderable Writings, would have been more to his Purpoſe than any he has ſhewed. For I do not know where to find any of them, nor has he produc'd one Author that aſcribes to the King an *unlimited Power*. If the Remedy the Parliament took was Unlawful, their Act was Rebellious, let the Provocation be ever ſo great. Could Subjects take Arms againſt their Sovereign without Rebellion? *Rapin*'s Buſineſs had been to prove Rebellion lawful, when the Subject wanted Redreſs of Grievances: Not to pretend to alter the Uſe of Words whoſe Meaning is ſo throughly eſtabliſh'd.

SINCE we are upon *Words*, how comes *Ruſhworth*'s Unfaithfulneſs, as an Hiſtorian, to be call'd Infidelity? An Infidel is an Unbeliever, not a Man unfit to be Truſted *.

HEAR him again: † " 'Tis, however, very
" certain, that *Ruſhworth*'s Aim and Deſign in
" publiſhing his Collections, was to cry down
" the King's Conduct, and favour the Parlia-
" ment's Cauſe. *But* Ruſhworth's *Intention*
" *ſignifies nothing to the knowing whether a Man*
" *may ſafely make uſe of his Collections.*

VERY good! Here's a Writer own'd to be Partial, and this takes off nothing from his Credit!

* Page 8. † Page 11.

EVEN

* "EVEN the moſt devoted Hiſtorians to "*Charles* I. have not been able to avoid ma- "king uſe of theſe ſame Papers."

MAY not a Man argue from his Enemy's own Mouth? Doth admitting one Part of his Collections, give Authority to all the reſt? Muſt I ſubſcribe to the whole of Mr. *Rapin*'s Hiſtory, becauſe I own he ſpeaks Truth ſometimes?

THIS impartial Gentleman tells us ‡, even after he has accus'd *Ruſhworth* of Partiality, this ſame *Ruſhworth* ſhall be his only Guide. "Though I have carefully read and made Col- "lections out of the Works of *Franklin*, *Nal- "ſon*, and the Earl of *Clarendon*, I did not "think myſelf obliged to quote them, becauſe "they let no Fact, no Paper paſs, without ap- "plying their Scheme to it, which is not al- "ways agreeable to mine."

SCHEMES in Hiſtory are pretty Things! I take the *Engliſh* of this to be, that the Great *Rapin* here beſpeaks a Party to purchaſe his Work, for his Faithfulneſs in *crying down the King's Conduct*, and juſtifying a moſt flagrant Rebellion.

AND who is it at laſt that put Mr. *Rapin* upon this Office of Garbling *Engliſh* Hiſtory? An Office ſo hard to go through by the beſt inclin'd and beſt inſtructed? Had he been appointed by Authority for ſo great a Burthen, he would, according to Cuſtom, have entertain'd us with a deep Senſe of his own Tenuity. But he has a more plauſible Way of ſecuring his Readers Favour, by Pretences of *Impartiality* only to be found in a Foreigner. So Libel

* Page 11. ‡ Page 15.

and

and Slander are propagated under Covert of *Impartiality*.

His being a Foreigner will not weigh with thoſe who know the Party he was liſted in when he was amongſt us: With thoſe who know a Foreigner may take Service on any Side to which his Prejudices and his Pay incline him.

As much as *Rapin* excludes Lord *Clarendon* from informing him, I find he can *quote* him, when he ſaith any Thing on the Side of the Parliament. For within ſeven Pages of his frank Declaration againſt his *Scheme*, as he calls it, * he brings him as Evidence of the *Grievances* occaſion'd by the King and the Miniſtry.

We find, after all, that Mr. *Rapin* wrote chiefly for the ſake of *Foreigners*. † To what a ſurprizing Exactneſs does his Performance agree with the *Burnetian* Scheme, and the *Stuartine* Hiſtory? How fortunate are the Republicans of *England*, who have Rebellion and Anarchy imported from diſtant Climes equalling the Product of their own!

——*Ex Te proveniet, vel aliunde Tibi.*

What has this trifling Foreigner to do as Judge in the Earl of *Strafford's* Caſe ‖? Can we not have an *Engliſh* Murther, but he muſt thruſt himſelf in to beſmear himſelf in noble Blood? Let him keep to his Facts, and the Pretences given for that execrable Deed. Is *Grubſtreet* a Court of Juſtice, from whence every little Pretender pronounces his Oracular Deciſions? His minute Talents are employed

* Page 22. † Page 50. ‖ Page 166.

to

to batter a Character himſelf could never merit, to ſooth and compliment the Envy of his Patrons.

THIS worthy Author's *Scheme* is pretty eaſily ſeen through, by his clean Way of expreſſing himſelf upon the rebellious Deſigns of the Commons *. Having juſt mention'd the Execution of the Earl, he ſaith, "The Commons re-"ſolv'd to compleat the Reformation of the "Govermnent." Again, when the King had ſubmitted to put the greateſt Enemies of the Crown into the chief Offices of Truſt and Profit under him; "They were too wiſe † to fall "into the Snare." So that when even the *Grievances* were remov'd, they were never the better contented. This Behaviour of theirs is juſtified upon Conſcience. ‖ "Many of them "were too *Conſcientious* to ſacrifice the Good "of their Country to their Private Intereſt." I am at a loſs to gueſs what *foreign* Country this Hiſtory was wrote for the Benefit of; which calls Rebellion Reformation; which makes trampling upon the Laws, ſeizing the Crown, and murthering the King, a Point of Conſcience in the Subject.

WE ſhall be told anon, that theſe Conſcientious Oppoſers of Kingſhip, who diſarm'd the King and brought him to the Block, were not the Men that cut off his Head. But if Mr. *Rapin*'s Authority be good, they would never have ſcrupled it: And would rather have been ſorry that any other took the Work out of their Hands.

MR. *Rapin* ſeems to know little of Mankind, or is willing to ſide with the worſt Part of it,

* Page 167. † Page 168. ‖ Ibid.

when

when he reproves Lord *Clarendon* upon the *Remonſtrance.* * "The Lord *Clarendon* ſays, It "was carried by the Hour of the Night, which "drove away a greater Number of old and "infirm Oppoſers, than would have made thoſe "of the Negative ſuperior in Number. But "this way of Reaſoning to me ſeems to be "weak. The ſame Thing may alſo be al-"ledg'd to prove, that it would have paſs'd "by more than nine Voices, if ſeveral of thoſe "who were for it had not gone out of the "Houſe. For how could Infirmity or Weak-"neſs have a greater Effect upon one Party "than the other."

WHEN ſhall we find an Age, where the Zeal to defend Truth and Juſtice is equal to that of deſtroying it? Though there may be a Majority ſometimes in the Right, yet are Men embarqued in a bad Deſign generally actuated with ſtronger Paſſions, and are more indefatigable in the Purſuit of Ill, than their Oppoſers in the Purſuit of Good. Theſe truſt, perhaps, to the Force of Truth, and to the Interpoſition of unforeſeen Accidents, to diſappoint their Enemies Views. The other expecting no Credit but from Succeſs, no Safety but from carrying their Point, go on like Men in Deſpair, and ſo ——— *Labor omnia vincit Improbus.* ——— Virg.

WE are now come to the great *Rapin*'s levying War againſt the King in Form; † that he may not be behind any of his Rebel Subjects. He is, as in Duty bound to his Patrons and Admirers, pleas'd to Remark upon the King's Declaration in Anſwer to the Remonſtrance:

* Page 212. † Page 267.

With

With Modeſty equal to his Brains, he charges the King with Inſincerity. " He clears himſelf " here from having any Inclinations to the *Ro-* " *miſh* Religion, and leaves the Conſequence " to be drawn, that ſince he is perſuaded of " the Truth of the Proteſtant Religion, it is " not poſſible he ſhould encourage the *Roman.* " But his Conduct had ſhewn that this Conſe- " quence did not neceſſarily follow, ſince it was " notorious that he had *countenanc'd* the Papiſts " from the Beginning of his Reign, whether " out of Complaiſance to the Queen, or from " ſome Political Views. "

THIS mighty Hiſtorian may take upon him, if he pleaſe, to expound for the Parliament, but nobody has employ'd him to expound for the King. *Countenancing* is a Word of large Extent, for Rebels a good uſeful Term, to expreſs juſt as much or as little as they would have it. Sometimes it ſignifies Encouragement, ſometimes Protection, ſometimes Toleration or forbearing to put in Execution Penal Statutes.

FROM this loweſt Degree of it, keeping Penal Laws *in terrorem*, and executing them but upon juſt Provocation, have the Parliament, and their Commentator *Rapin*, accus'd the King of encouraging, and even of deſigning to bring in the Popiſh Religion. If the Papiſts of thoſe Days acted as faithful Subjects in Civil Matters, it was more than the King had Reaſon to expect from the *Puritans*, one Sort of which *Rapin* repreſents as Rebels by Principle. The *Puritans*, ſome of which he calls *Politicians*, were all *Politicians* enough to know it was not the King's Intereſt to baniſh thoſe who had diſcover'd no Averſion to Kingly State, to leave himſelf in the Hands of ſuch as profeſs'd that Averſion.

As he was throughly convinc'd the Church of *England* was preferable to the *Romiſh*, as this laſt retain'd the Novelties and Errors the *Engliſh* had renounc'd; and that this Renunciation of theſe Novelties and Errors was defenſible from the Practice of the pureſt Ages and the ſtrongeſt Reaſon, he had Grounds to hope thoſe of his Subjects who had not oppos'd his Civil Government, would at length ſubmit to Authority and Reaſon. That they would in Time ſee through the Papal Uſurpations, the Craft and Artifice by which he arriv'd at his Power; and look upon thoſe Super-additions ſo ſtrenuouſly ſupported, as nothing more than Politick Inſtruments to gain over Princes and People a Temporal Dominion.

The King's pious Example might have weighed much with theſe: But what rivetted them in their antient Superſtition, was the Exceſſes of Reformation, the throwing off Good and Bad together; not admitting Things Orderly and Decent, but ſetting up Deformity and Madneſs in their Room. They ſaw the Archbiſhop perſecuted to Death, and the reſt of the Orthodox Clergy ruin'd, to make Way for Anarchy and Enthuſiaſm. So hideous a Face as the Sectaries ſhew'd, frighted them from embracing the Church of *England*, which they foreſaw was to be new-modelled by theſe.

Into this Office has Mr. *Rapin* put himſelf, to determine that the King countenanc'd the Papiſts, becauſe he did not proſecute them when they liv'd peaceably. Suppoſing this to be juſtly term'd Countenancing, doth it ſhew what it was brought to ſhew, that the King was Popiſhly affected, and deſign'd to bring in Popery? Were not two thirds of the *Dutch* Army Papiſts,

Papiſts, who came over hither at the Revolution? Would that prove thoſe who brought them Popiſhly affected? Or would the Pope's being for dethroning King *James*, prove him about to turn Proteſtant?

SEVEN Prieſts were condemn'd, as Prieſts only, not as in any Treaſonable Conſpiracy. Theſe, at the Inſtance of the *French* Ambaſſador, the King was inclin'd to Baniſh, not to Execute. "The Parliament petition'd the "King to order the Execution." * Upon this, ſaith our Hiſtorian, "Be this as it will, the "Prieſts were not Executed; for though afterwards the King left it to both Houſes to put "to Death or ſave them, they did not think "fit to take upon them either to Pardon or "Execute. All this was extreamly *injurious* "to the King, ſince at the very Time he ſolemnly proteſted, that he was reſolv'd to put "the Laws in Execution, he granted his Protection to theſe ſeven Prieſts convicted according to Law, and had *no Regard* to the "Inſtances of both Houſes."

IF this Author is not *injurious* to the King, nobody could be ſo. But it's become a Faſhion to publiſh and receive the moſt ſenſeleſs Scandal. Had the King no Regard to the Inſtances of the Parliament, when he left the Lives of theſe Men to their Diſpoſal, whom, of his natural Clemency, he would have ſuffer'd to go into Baniſhment. Blood was not all that they thirſted after, not even Royal Blood. But they muſt drive the King to an Action that would expoſe him to all *Europe*, and make him juſtly hated. The Odium was too great for them to

* Page 278.

bear, but he muſt be their Executioner. Nothing more was wanting to incline that Prince to Favour, than his own merciful Temper. But it's probable they had a farther View, to render him, in the State to which they were going to reduce him, hated and unpitied. They did not know but ſome foreign Power might arm in his Defence, and protect him from his Rebel Subjects: But if they could deſtroy his Credit and his Character, they ſhould more ſecurely execute their Deſigns againſt him.

WILL a Sanguinary Law always juſtify the Execution of it? Are not ſome Laws made but *in Terrorem*, to be ready for Execution when Danger, not Clamour, exacts it? Would theſe worthy Gentlemen, or their Advocate Mr. *Rapin*, have the *Popiſh* Powers Abroad uſe this Retaliation? Would they have Laws enacted by them, that make it Death to be a Proteſtant there? How would they have Ambaſſadors and Merchants treated?

BANISHMENT might have clear'd the Nation of Prieſts, without Blood. If that Puniſhment would not have done it, they were in the Way of the other. The ſame Statute ſtands againſt Prieſts to this Day, but it has been very ſparingly executed by thoſe who ſucceeded *Charles* I. I do not know of any Prieſt ſuffering, as a Prieſt only, ſince the Revolution. Why therefore ſhall Mr. *Rapin* lay ſo great a Load upon King *Charles*, for acting as others have done after him, and eſcap'd his Cenſure?

BUT the Parliament requeſted it of King *Charles*. They did, indeed, command him to do it, that he might thereby Execute his own Reputation. But how ſincerely did they requeſt

queſt it, when they would not do it themſelves upon Leave? The King promis'd to put the Laws in Execution againſt *Papiſts*. Theſe Laws he never meant to ſtrain to the Rigour, only to make Sport for his rebellious Subjects. Himſelf was Judge when Puniſhment was neceſſary. If Laws are made for Prevention of Evil, whenever that Evil is prevented the Law has had its End. The Power of Saving, as well as the Power of Killing, is a Part of the Prerogative never yet call'd in Queſtion. Would the Patrons of *Rapin* have every Man's Life taken that had been forfeited? What would have become of many of theſe Demanders of Juſtice, upon the Reſtoration, if the Race of *Stuarts* had not been endow'd with that merciful Diſpoſition ſome of them had Occaſion to experience?

It would rouſe the Spleen of a *Stoick* to ſee Majeſty thus treated by little Scribblers. How does this Inſect, pluming itſelf upon the Triumphal Chariot of the Rebels, look down upon the affronted King with its Remarks? * "This "Article of the King's Anſwer ſeems *very* "*Weak*. For the Parliament having ſet forth "in their Declaration the Reaſons why they "believ'd there was a ſettled Deſign to alter "Religion in *England*, and that the King en- "courag'd the Authors, his Majeſty only an- "ſwers in Generals."

Let us now tranſcribe the Paragraph which this Trifler takes upon him to examine, and to repreſent *Weak*, as himſelf has given it. † "For "our faithful and zealous Affection for the

* Page 393. † Page 392.

"Proteſtant

" Proteſtant Profeſſion, and our Reſolution to " concur with our Parliament in any poſſible " Courſe for the Propagation of it, and the Sup- " preſſion of Popery, we can ſay no more than " we have already expreſs'd in our Declaration " to our loving Subjects, publiſh'd in *Ireland* " by the Advice of our Privy-Council: In " which we endeavour'd to make as lively a " Confeſſion of ourſelf in this Point as we were " able, being moſt aſſur'd, that the conſtant " Practice of our Life hath been anſwerable " thereunto; and therefore we did rather ex- " pect a Teſtimony and Acknowledgment of " ſuch our Zeal and Piety, than thoſe Expreſ- " ſions we met with in the Declaration, of any " Deſign of altering Religion in this Kingdom; " and we do, out of the Innocence of our Soul, " wiſh that the Judgments of Heaven may be " manifeſted upon thoſe who have, or have " had any ſuch Deſign. "

THIS ſpeaks for itſelf. The Commentator's *Weakneſs* is eaſily ſeen.

AGAIN, * " A Sort of Sophiſtry runs quite " through this Article. "

QUITE the contrary, as they may ſee who read it. 'Tis the laſt but one of the King's Declarations. I am tir'd with raking into this Maſs of Blunders, Inconſiſtencies, and ſtupid Reflections.

WE are wonderfully edified by *Rapin*'s Deſcription of the Parliament: ‡ " A Body con- " ſiſting of the King and the two Houſes. "

Is the King a Part of the Parliament? How then does the King call a Parliament? How does he diſſolve a Parliament? How did he

* Page 400. ‡ Page 435.

govern

govern without a Parliament? He might as well have ſaid, the King and the Council, are the Council. The Council conſiſts of the Counſellors: And the Parliament of the Knights, Citizens, and Burgeſſes, for the Lower Houſe, and the Lords for the Upper.

WHERE does this Man pick up his Knowledge of the *Engliſh* Conſtitution, when he ſays, * "I do not think it was ever decided to what "Acts the King may, or may not deny his "Aſſent. So there ariſes an inexhauſtible "Source of Diſputes, when the King and Par-"liament do not agree."

WE were told juſt now, the King makes a Part of the Parliament. But what Foundation is there for this inexhauſtible Source of Diſputes? Was it ever yet ſaid by any Man, that the King has not a Liberty of rejecting any Bills? Why does he call a Bill an Act, for it's no Act till it has the Royal Aſſent? And how would it be an Aſſent, if he is forc'd to give it?

DOES this Man ſet up for an Inſtructor, a Remarker, and a Cenſurer of what is *Weak?* The Remark laſt mention'd ſeems to be the Work of a Finiſher, who overſees the Performance, and puts the laſt Hand to it. An excellent Hand it is! Would not a Stranger imagine from hence, that it was the Cuſtom for the Lords or Commons, or both, to bring their Bills as to an Office to have them ſeal'd by the King? For ſome, it ſeems, he *may* Aſſent to, and ſome he *muſt* Aſſent to, if Mr. *Rapin* is to explain our Conſtitution for us. He *does not think this was ever decided.* How is a Thing

* Page 471.

decided

decided that was never brought in Queſtion? He *thinks* ſometimes much to the Purpoſe. If he knew any thing of the antient Uſage of Parliament, he would ſay, A Bill was a Draught of a Law which the Parliament petition'd the King to eſtabliſh. And if the Petition be at preſent dropp'd, the Enacting Authority is ſtill in the Crown; and the Bill is ſtill humbly offer'd in the Nature of a Requeſt.

I CANNOT but think Mr. *Rapin*'s Finiſher had an Itch to be *Deciding* this knotty Affair, ſtill to encreaſe his Merit with the *Engliſh*: And that he really had ſubjoin'd his *Deciſion* to this Remark, never backward in ſhewing his Parts: But that ſome other Finiſher upon this Finiſher, thought he talk'd a little *weakly*, and therefore depriv'd us of ſeeing his Ignorance ſtill more illuſtrious.

WE ſee at length Mr. *Rapin*'s Determination againſt the King: Though no body elſe is capable of making out any Thing from Hiſtory, as, in his great Wiſdom, he pronounces. * "It "muſt firſt be laid down as a Fact that needs "no Proof, after what has been ſaid, that the "King had form'd a Deſign to eſtabliſh an "Arbitrary Government in *England*. They "who deny this, have nothing to do but to "frame and deviſe a more natural Cauſe of "the People's Diſcontent againſt his Govern-"ment."

IF he were talking of Syſtems of Philoſophy, he might offer his Project, and tell us, if we do not find it ſolves all *Phænomena*, we may get a better.

* Page 518.

But he has ſolv'd this himſelf, *and fram'd and devis'd a more natural Cauſe of the People's Diſcontent.* * "Thus the *Presbyterian* Party "prevailing in both Houſes, and their private "Aim being to alter the Church-Government; "but the Thing being impracticable, as long "as the King kept his Power, it is evident, that, "according to this Project, it was the Parlia-"ment's Buſineſs, who were directed by the "*Presbyterians*, carefully to avoid whatever "tended to an Accommodation, which would "have broken all their Meaſures."

He that has Eyes doth not want Mr. *Rapin* to decide, That the Parliament had a Deſign to demoliſh the Crown and the Church, and ſhare their Power and Revenues.

"I do believe it, ſaith he ‡, to be ſomething "raſh to affirm, that *Charles* I. was not ſincere "in his Promiſes. But then I am of Opinion "his Sincerity may be doubted, ſince he had "never an Opportunity to demonſtrate it by "Effects."

The Man had undertaken a Defence of the Rebellion, and is bewilder'd in his Progreſs: He aſſerts without Foundation, and explains away his own Explanation, and ſuppoſes his Readers Children or Fools.

Did not *Charles* I. *demonſtrate by Effects*, that he was willing to ſilence all Complaints, by diveſting himſelf of Royalty, by giving up the Conſtitution when he gave up the Biſhops, and perpetuating a Rebel Parliament?

The King's *Sincerity muſt be doubted, becauſe he never had Opportunity to demonſtrate it.*

* Page 522. ‡ Page 523.

But the Parliament's Sincerity cannot admit of a Doubt, *who had Opportunity to demonſtrate it by Effects!* They thought themſelves oblig'd to quell Kingly Power, according to the *Fundamental Laws*. Theſe ſame *Fundamental Laws* gave them as good a Title to aboliſh the Houſe of Lords: So *Fundamental Laws*, no where to be ſeen, were to raiſe Rebellion, and trifling Hiſtories to defend it.

THE uſe of Hiſtory is to keep Mankind in *Decorum*; to ſhew the Errors of Ambition uſing lawful Authority to Oppreſs: To ſhew alſo how Men have been impos'd upon, by the Craft and Artifice of thoſe out of Authority, to ſet a State on Fire, that themſelves might run away with the Plunder. When Hiſtory is perverted to inflame a Luſt of Power, or to palliate the unjuſt Invaſion of it, 'tis no better than Flattery or Satire.

As Government is neceſſary to the Peace and Well-being of Mankind, it is, of Conſequence, neceſſary that the Perſons inveſted with Authority ſhould be protected from the Inſults of malevolent Tongues: That they ſhould be look'd upon with a Paternal Regard, not made the Object of Jeſt and Drollery, tolerable only amongſt Equals. It may be eſteem'd amongſt the worſt of the Remains of this Rebellion, that Majeſty never recover'd that Reverence and Veneration of which it was then diveſted. The Freedoms taken in Coffee-houſe Chat, and Calves-Head Feaſts, advanc'd at length to Libel and Pamphlet, from whence ſome Hiſtories are compos'd. The Abuſe of Hiſtory is as viſible, as *Hudibras* obſerv'd the Abuſe of Laws.

As

As when the Sea breaks o're its Bounds,
And overflows the level Grounds,
The Banks and Dams, which, as a Skreen,
Did keep it out, now keep it in.
So when rebellious Uſurpation
Invades the Freedom of a Nation,
The Laws o'th' Land, which were intended
To keep it out, are made defend it.

ARCHBISHOP *Laud*, and the Court-Biſhops, are charg'd * with adding "ſundry In-"novations, which gave Offence not only to "the *Presbyterians*, but alſo to many Church "of *England* Men †. Among theſe Grie-"vances, ſome related to Religion, as the In-"novations which offended the Churchmen "no leſs than the *Presbyterians* themſelves."

WHAT were theſe Innovations, and who were theſe Church of *England* Men? Why might we not have had the Things and the Perſons named, ſince none of the Perſons are upon Record? The Innovations we muſt gueſs were the Surplice, and Kneeling at the Communion, becauſe theſe were what the Reforming Parliament ſhew'd their firſt Zeal againſt; aboliſhing the one, and removing the Communion-Table from the Chancel, to prevent the other.

IF by Church of *England* Men, he means ſuch *Presbyterians* as had complied with the Church for Preferment, or ſuch as were reſolv'd never to quit any, he may be right in his Aſſertion. But if he means Church of *England* Men in their Hearts, ſuch as would fall with

* Page 519. † Page 520.

the Church, rather than deſert or betray it for a Livelihood, he'll be charg'd with publiſhing a Falſhood.

Mr. *Rapin* has chiefly employed his Talents in expoſing the King, in queſtioning his Sincerity, and ſometimes accuſing him of the higheſt Inſincerity. Such a Station has he exalted himſelf to, confiding in his great Abilities to oblige a Set of Patrons.

He now turns Advocate for the *Presbyterians*, who lie, as he ſaith, under ſome Accuſations of their Enemies: * And ſhews himſelf Maſter of Defence as well as of Offence. "It is cer-"tain, that from the very Beginning there was "in this Parliament a *Presbyterian* Party, whoſe "Aim was to alter the Church-Government. "But that this was the ſole View of the *Pres-"byterians*, as many aſſert, is what I do not "ſee any ſure Grounds for. Why might not "theſe Men, with their Endeavours to erect "their Diſcipline upon the Ruins of the "Church, join another End, I mean, the Pre-"vention of the King's and his Party's En-"croachments upon the publick Liberty?—— "The *Presbyterian* Party therefore muſt be "conſider'd as acting with thoſe two Views; "and this is ſo true, that undeniable Proofs of "it will appear in the Sequel of this Reign. "But their *Enemies* have been pleas'd to aſ-"cribe to them the firſt only, that they might "charge them with putting the Kingdom in a "Flame, purely for the ſake of eſtabliſhing the "*Presbyterian* Government in the Church."

Should not this have been ſpoken *inter Nos*, in Confidence? Should a Friend to the

* Page 560.

Pres-

Presbyterians have blabbed out this? What! the *Presbyterians* without a Deſign to pull down the King, or, in other Words, without a Deſign to reduce him to ſuch a State as he might be corrected! Who ever reflected thus upon their Zeal? Who ever ſaid they would ſit down with Spiritual Dominion?

And who are theſe Enemies that treat them thus inhumanly? Their Enemies, if I can gueſs at them, muſt be either the Churchmen whom they diſpoſſeſs'd, and whom they would always diſpoſſeſs; or their dear Offspring the *Independents*, and other Sectaries, their Grandchildren, and Great-Grandchildren.

For Churchmen, I never heard of any but were as ready as Mr. *Rapin* can be, to allow them all he contends for. So that once the Churchmen and Mr. *Rapin* are of a Mind. If the *Independents*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Antinomeans*, or *Fifth-Monarchy* Men, are guilty of this Slander, it is *inter Nos*, not come to every body's Knowledge. Do theſe envy them the ſweet Reflection of having overturn'd the State as well as the Church? Or where are we to look for this Hoſtile Band? Are they to be found amongſt the *Foreigners*, for whoſe ſake, Mr. *Rapin* ſaith, he * wrote his Hiſtory, or where?

He ever takes Care, I cannot ſay Occaſion when none is given, to repreſent the King to Diſadvantage, even where there is no Colour for doing it. † "One may obſerve in this "Meſſage, as in all his other Papers, the Ge-"nius and Character of *Charles* I. It was his "Way continually to make uſe of obſcure Ex-"preſſions, the Interpretation whereof he re-

* Vol XII. p. 39. † Page 7.

"ſerv'd

" ſerv'd to himſelf. —— It may be obſerv'd, " that thoſe Sort of little Artifices were one of " the principal Cauſes of this Prince's Misfor- " tunes, by Reaſon of their making him for- " feit the Truſt and Confidence of his Sub- " jects. "

FOR theſe ſaucy Flirts, I preſume, this doughty Hiſtorian thinks to gain Credit from his Patrons: And to be reckon'd a Man that had *made fine Speeches againſt the King*, like the Heroic *Nathanael Fiennes*, whom he records ‡ for that ſignal Service.

I AM not inclin'd to ſurfeit the Reader with eſcorting *Rapin* through his whole March. To ſhew he may find juſt the ſame Treatment of *Charles* II. I ſhall paſs from hence to the twelfth Year after his Reſtoration, and with that Part of this King's Reign finiſh my tedious Examination.

I DESIRE this may be remember'd, in Favour of that Monarch, and in Anſwer to thoſe who charge him with Deſign upon his People's Liberties; That in giving up the Court of Wards and Liveries, he gave up an antient Branch of the Royal Power, and that which was the moſt offenſive to the People in general. He had an Equivalent in the Hereditary Exciſe, and the other Branch of it which was to determine with his Life. Yet ſo great an Happineſs was this Condeſcention eſteem'd to the Nation, never before ſecure, but a Stranger to the Family, or an Enemy to it, might poſſeſs the Eſtate of their Anceſtors, that it was receiv'd with an univerſal Teſtimony of Joy and Gratitude: And had it remain'd to this Day, would have

‡ Page 100.

been

been reckon'd a Grievance equal to all the Grievances of Exciſe put together.

Mr. *Rapin*, as Maſter of the Stage, brings on Kings for the Diverſion of *Republicans*. The Part Princes are to act, is not only Ridiculous but Criminal, and the Cataſtrophe is ever to their Condemnation. One King is ſaid to have too much Religion, the other too little, yet both are repreſented with the ſame View, aiming at the Deſtruction of the Church of *England*, for which Mr. *Rapin* and Lord *Shaftesbury* are the two Men chiefly concern'd.

Look through the Lives of the three firſt of the Race of *Stuarts* governing here, and we have their Faults ſet forth, and their Sufferings all charg'd to their Miſmanagement. As ſurely as he enters upon a Reign, he brings up Deſigns for Popery and Arbitrary Power; Miniſters indulging their Prince in Ambitious Projects, contemning the Advice of Parliaments, and paving the Way to their own and their Maſter's Deſtruction.

His Hiſtory is like an Almanack, beginning with Coldneſs in the Prince for the Intereſt of the Nation, then Heats in Parliament, ending in a Storm upon the Miniſtry; the King always charg'd with Deſigns upon the People, whom it was never poſſible to influence or ſeduce to uſe him ill.

With this diſcerning Gentleman it is not poſſible to have Fears and Jealouſies infus'd, to have them aggravated and blown up, till they break out in a Flame: Even Lord *Shaftesbury* could do nothing of this. For if there had not been Reaſon for Fears and Jealouſies, it was not in the Power of any Man to produce them. But might not theſe Reaſons be forg'd and impos'd?

pos'd? Was there never ſuch a Thing as a Prince miſrepreſented to his Subjects, by Malice and Revenge?

THUS much he frankly owns; * "I content myſelf with ſaying once for all, that this "Lord us'd all his Intereſt and Credit to break "the Meaſures of the King and his Miniſters."

POPERY and Arbitrary Power are Things to be dreaded: And there never will be wanting a *Shaftesbury* or a *Rapin* to proclaim that Danger, whether real or not, to ſerve their Purpoſe. He pronounces this to have been a Deſign; that the Suſpicion of ſuch a Deſign is Reaſon enough to affirm it, and guard againſt it. He can carry it no farther than a Suſpicion, which is in the Power of every Pretender to give out, without any Overt-Act to found it on. If Men are to be judg'd by Suſpicion, and the Grounds of that Suſpicion not diſcover'd, this is giving Arbitrary Power to every Man to act according to his Suſpicion, whether real or pretended. Thus may a Traveller be aſſaulted on Suſpicion of being a Highwayman, though he has given no other Cauſe for it but being prepar'd for a Defence: Unleſs he will ſtrip himſelf of his Arms, and expoſe himſelf to the Inſults of his Enemies, he may, with the ſame Equity, be accus'd of a Deſign upon them.

RAPIN, himſelf being Judge, baffles other Writers, who attribute the Ill-Blood of thoſe Times to *Shaftesbury*'s infuſing. Theſe were dictated to by ſome intereſted Perſon or other, and therefore no Regard to be had to them.

* Page 28.

He

He ſhews you Popery and Arbitrary Power in full March againſt you, though without one Sillable of Proof, and then concludes the Remedy is juſt.

* " It is eaſy to ſee, that their Deſign is " to leſſen the Occaſion of the Parliament's " Fear and Complaint of the Conduct of the " Court, by inſinuating that they were frivo- " lous, and the mere Effects of *Shaftesbury*'s " Vengeance, who, they tell you, directed " both Houſes of Parliament, or rather had " them entirely at Command. For my Part, " I am no way concern'd to vindicate the Ho- " nour of the Earl of *Shaftesbury*, but believe " myſelf oblig'd to remark, for the helping " my Reader to the Diſcovery of the Truth, " that the Project of the Cabal to render the " King Abſolute, and introduce Popery, is of " unqueſtionable Certainty. "

This unqueſtionable Certainty at laſt amounts to no more than Suſpicion artfully introduc'd and encourag'd.

" The Authors now mention'd make no " Scruple of owning this; and ſhould they not " own it, the Thing would be no leſs true. Con- " ſequently the Parliament coming to a full " and exact Knowledge of this Deſign, which " was only ſuſpected before, had all the Rea- " ſon in the World for their Fears and Cau- " tions againſt the King and his Miniſters. Let " this be granted, and the Thing will be the " ſame, whether the Earl of *Shaftesbury* was a " Villain, or an honeſt Man; whether he be- " trayed the King's Secrets, and acted only by " a Spirit of Revenge; whether his Fear of

* Page 27.

" the Parliament was the ſole Motive of his " embracing the Country Party againſt the " King, or whether he was led to it by a Prin- " ciple of Honour and Duty, in order to ſave " the Church and State. "

AGAIN, * " Thoſe who would aſcribe the " ill Humour of the Commons to the Practices " of the Earl of *Shaftesbury*, are hard put to it " to anſwer the above-mention'd Facts, which " would not be at all the leſs true, though " the Earl of *Shaftesbury* had never been born. "

THIS I bring as a *Specimen* of Mr. *Rapin's* Skill or Integrity in writing Hiſtory. The Deſign of bringing in Popery and Arbitrary Power by King *Charles*, was barely *ſuſpected*, till *Shaftesbury* reveal'd the King's Secrets, and help'd the Parliament to the Proofs of it.

WHERE now are the Proofs, or one ſingle Proof of it brought, upon which this *Unqueſtionable Certainty* is founded?

IT is not poſſible, with Mr. *Rapin*, for a Man to be an Incendiary, or if he be ſuch, to infuſe Fears and Jealouſies into Mens Heads without a real Foundation.

GRANT him what he asks, and he has done his Work. Grant *that the Parliament came to a full and exact Knowledge of this Deſign which was only ſuſpected before*, and there was Reaſon for their Fears and Cautions.

HE that has a Mind to Grant, may as well Grant, that the Thing was, after this pretended *Knowledge*, but *ſuſpected*; and that the Earl, by his Craft, improv'd that *Suſpicion*, which the Retailers of Slander have improv'd into *Knowledge*.

* Page 61.

Was not the *Iriſh* Fright in 1688, concerted, and propagated by People planted all over *England*, who had their Notice by the Poſt when to begin it?

But would Mr. *Rapin* ſay, If the *Iriſh* burn'd ſuch a Town, and ſuch a Town, in ſhort, moſt of the Cities and Market-Towns in the Nation; and went about cutting the Throats of Men, Women and Children, what need we trouble ourſelves, who gave the Information, whether ever there was ſuch a Man as Mareſchal *Schomberg* born.

The Lie, even of the Day, has been extremely ſerviceable to Stock-Jobbers and Sedition-Jobbers. Some Inſtances of this are not out of Memory, though not convenient to produce.

Is this an ingenuous Way of repreſenting Things to Poſterity? At this Rate 'tis all one whether there is Proof for a Thing, or no Proof: Suſpicion is enough to act upon, and to juſtify the moſt diſorderly Actions.

Proof is a Method below this Author to deal in. Take his Word for the following Point of Hiſtory, for he does not ſo much as pretend to bring any Evidence for it. * "When "the King's Affectation of boaſting continually "his Zeal for the *Proteſtant* Religion, and againſt "*Popery*, and on the other Hand his Abjuration of that Religion, and a Chapel ſecretly "erected in his Palace, where he every Day "heard *Maſs*, ſo as ſometimes to Communicate the ſame Day at both his *Proteſtant* and "*Popiſh* Chapels; when theſe Things, I ſay,

* Page 43.

" are conſider'd, one knows not what to think " of ſuch monſtrous Diſſimulation. "

He might as well have ſaid, *When theſe Things are prov'd.* It is enough that Mr. *Rapin* has ſaid ſo. This will ſerve a Cauſe; this will go down with a Party for whoſe Sake it was wrote. With others it will paſs for Scandal and Impudence, of a Piece with the reſt of the Performance.

Just ſuch another Piece of Forgery is this. * " That the King imagin'd, that, after the " Peace was made, the King of *France* would " aſſiſt him to become abſolute Maſter of his " Kingdoms, and furniſh him with Money to " maintain the thirty thouſand Men, without " his having any Neceſſity to apply to his Par- " liament. "

This deep Politician cannot otherwiſe unriddle the Difficulty of the King's raiſing an Army when a Peace was in View. It is to be hoped, a Peace is always in View, when an Army is rais'd: And it's known to be the moſt proper Way of making Peace with a Sword in Hand. It is ſomething unreaſonable, that a Prince ſhould be oblig'd to give Account to Mr. *Rapin*, or his diſaffected Subjects, of all the Steps he takes to ſecure his Reputation Abroad, and to defend himſelf from being over-reach'd and diſtreſs'd at Home.

If we ask for the Proof of this Agreement of *Louis* XIV. to make King *Charles* abſolute, it is not, indeed, upon Mr. *Rapin's* bare Word, as uſually, but upon Dr. *Swift's*, that this Piece of Secret Hiſtory is founded. || *Does my Brother of* France *think to ſerve me thus? Are all*

* Page 107. || Page 106.

his

his Promiſes to make me Abſolute Maſter of my Realms come to this? Or does he think that a Thing to be done with eight thouſand Men?

THIS ſhould have been found in *Montague*'s Letters, reprinted by *Rapin*, or ſome ſuch ſort of Authority, if he would have gain'd Credit for it from any but his own Patrons.

HERE's no Attempt of *Louis* at laſt to do this Thing, but a Parcel of Reaſons, of Mr. *Rapin*'s inventing, why he ſhould alter his Mind. If he would have engag'd the King not to keep up above 8000 Men, it looks as if he was providing againſt a ſudden Succour of the *Dutch* upon any freſh Attempt.

IT was enough for the King to ſecure *Flanders* as a Barrier, to ſtop the *French* from overrunning *Holland*. The Nation had no other Intereſt to protect a Rival in Trade; who had inſulted the Crown, and maſſacred the *Engliſh* at *Amboyna*, than to keep the *French* from being too powerful, by the Acceſſion of the *Netherlands* and the *Dutch* Fleet. And if the King made *Louis* Tributary to him, whilſt he held that Balance, there was no Hurt in it to his Subjects; but a Grief to the Seditious Party, that he had an Influence Abroad, and was not reduc'd to be their Penſioner and Slave. Had he purchas'd Peace with Money, what would *Shaftesbury* and *Rapin* have ſaid of him? But as he receiv'd it in Acknowledgment of his Power, he is out of the Way of their Contempt.

A FOREIGNER has an Advantage in writing our Hiſtory, as will appear from the two following Inſtances. He need not ſee an Author that might, probably, ſhake his Scheme.

The

The Notes upon *Rapin* ſay, * " From this, " and ſeveral other Paſſages, it appears, that " *Rapin* had never ſeen *Burnet's* Hiſtory hither- " to, notwithſtanding ſome Quotations, which " might poſſibly be inſerted afterwards. *Ra-* " *pin* died within ſo little a while after the ſaid " Hiſtory was publiſh'd, that he muſt have " finiſh'd this Reign before it came to his " Hands. "

THERE might have been another Reaſon given for his not ſeeing it, if he could: That is, it would have contradicted his Scheme of the Popiſh Plot. For in this Point, and one more, that of the Earl of *Eſſex*, doth Biſhop *Burnet* run counter to all the reſt of his Party. He tells us at large his Thoughts upon the Popiſh Plot; That the Conſpiracy was all Sham: That he had a long Converſation with the King upon that Subject: That the King ſuſpected *Shaftesbury* to be the Contriver of it, whilſt himſelf could not imagine any but *Oates*, for there ſeem'd to be nothing above *Oates's* reach.

IT was not proper, nor is it yet, that an Author, ſo much to be depended upon for other Things in the Courſe of *Rapin's* Hiſtory, ſhould be brought in here to take off the Credit of a Plot upon which the moſt unjuſt Imputations upon *Charles* II. are founded. If *Rapin* did not ſee *Burnet's* Account of the Plot, it was a narrow and a lucky Eſcape for him. But it's plain he ſaw it before this very Book, containing the Buſineſs of the Popiſh Plot, was finiſh'd; this 23d Book of Vol. XIV. Becauſe, in this very Book, the Writer has been highly beholden to

* Page 174.

that

that Prelate for a moſt malicious Satire upon the King *. So that it's plain, *The Reign of Charles* II. was not finiſh'd before it came to his Hands, unleſs the Account of that King's Death is not to be reckon'd into his Reign: At leaſt it is a Part of the 23d Book, the former Part of which we cannot believe printed off, before the latter was written. Nay, we find *Rapin* quoting *Burnet*'s Account of his own Times, ſaying, † "That *Sharp* had done enough to "merit the Hatred of the *Presbyterians*:" And this Quotation is within 42 Pages of that where the Tranſlator ſaith, "*Rapin* had not "yet ſeen *Burnet*."

‡ *RAPIN* has the ſame Advantage upon Sir *Edmondbury Godfrey*'s Death. As a Foreigner, he may pretend to have ſeen no other Accounts of *Godfrey*'s Death than he has mention'd: But, as an Hiſtorian, he ſhould have been Maſter of all that is material on both Sides the Queſtion. Sir *Roger L'Eſtrange* did, in the Year 1688, publiſh a Volume in Octavo, treating of the Death of Sir *Edmondbury Godfrey*, printed for *Sare* at *Gray's-Inn-Gate*.

I WILL premiſe, that Sir *Roger* is an Author not in the good Graces of *Rapin*, or of any of his Clan. But if Sir *Roger* brings Authentick Vouchers for what he would make People believe; if theſe Vouchers are ſtill to be ſeen, neither *Rapin*'s Prejudices, nor *Burnet*'s Hearſay from Biſhop *Lloyd*, quoted in the Notes to *Rapin* ‖, will have any Weight with a candid Judge.

* Page 365. † *Rapin*, p. 220. ‡ Page 178. ‖ Page 179.

SIR

Sir *Roger* has the following Words, concluding his Dedication to Poſterity of the Piece above-mention'd.

" I have farther (for the ſtopping of all " Mouths) depoſited the Originals in the *Paper-Office*, to the End that whoever doubts " whether they are Authentique or not, needs " go no farther for Satisfaction than to the " Bundle itſelf, as it remains there under the " Title of, *Enformations concerning the Death " of Sir* Edmondbury Godfrey. "

If *Rapin* had not read *L'Eſtrange*, 'tis pretty plain *Echard* had, whom *Rapin* has quoted. *Rapin* cenſures *Echard* for bringing no Authority for what he aſſerts, which 'tis plain *Echard* could have done if he would. * " In a con- " troverted Matter, when an Hiſtorian reports " Facts to which he was not privy, and are " nevertheleſs capable to decide for or againſt, " the Reader has a Right to expect from him " ſome Teſtimony, ſome Warrant of what he " ſays, in a Word, to be aſſur'd from whence " he has his Knowledge of ſuch Facts. "

The following Sentence is in *L'Eſtrange*, upon *Prance*'s ſwearing backwards and forwards, ſometimes retracting, ſometimes ſtanding to the Evidence he had given. † " And in this lat- " ter Caſe, the Keepers were effectually under " the Direction of a certain *Ambulatory Com- " mittee*, when, and in what Degree, to ſqueeze, " to pinch, to eaſe, to ſhackle, to comfort, or " to torment their Priſ'ners; and little or no- " thing was done, but according to the Order

* Page 180.

† *L'Eſtrange*, p. 74.

" and

" and Diſpoſition, either general or particular, " of the Cabal. "

RAPIN, tranſlated into *Engliſh*, has this as quoted from *Echard*: || " The Keepers were " then under the ſole Direction of a certain " *Ambulatory Committee*, when and what De- " gree, to ſqueeze, to pinch, to eaſe, to ſhackle, " to comfort, or to torment their Priſoners; " and moſt Things were done according to the " particular Orders of that Cabal. "

HERE's little Difference, except that *Echard* has put in *moſt Things* inſtead of *little or nothing*, which, if *L'Eſtrange* be his Authority, he ſhould not have chang'd.

I WAS ſurpriz'd to find the *Engliſh* ſo exactly following *Echard*, which had been firſt turn'd into *French*. It muſt have been written from *Echard*: An *Ambulatory Committee* was ſomething hard to bring into that Language. *Rapin*, ignorant of its Meaning, gives it in the Plural Number. For the Reader's Curioſity the Sentence is thus, *Ses Geoliers etoient a lors ſou la Direction de* certains Committez ambulans *dont ils recevoent les Ordres, pour ſerrer, pour pincer, pour ſoulager, pour mettre au fers, pour conſoler, pour tourmenter leurs Priſonniers, & la plupart de choſes ſe faiſoient par les Ordres de cette Cabalé.*

THE *French* has His Goalers, the *Engliſh* The Goalers.

I WILL now produce a Part of Biſhop *Lloyd*'s Anſwer to the Commiſſion of Enquiry, which Sir *Roger* ſaith is repoſited in the *Paper-Office*, omitting, for Brevity, the greateſt Part,

|| Page 180.

which the Reader may find at large in Sir *Roger*, or in the *Paper-Office*. It is thus introduc'd by Sir *Roger* : * " The Commiſſion of " Enquiry to the Reverend Dean of *Bangor*, " both from his Majeſty and the *Lords Com-* " *mittees*, into this Buſineſs of Sir *Edmondbury* " *Godfrey*, gave his preſent Lordſhip great Ad- " vantages of ſeeing farther into this Intrigue " than another Man ; and if they had left the " Story to Common Fame, without bringing " in ſuch Witneſſes to make good the Impoſ- " ture, as were ſufficient to blaſt the Credit " even of Truth itſelf ; I ſee nothing to the " contrary, but that it might have liv'd many " a fair Day without Control. I never ſaw (ſays the Dean, *April* 16, 1686.) " how *Prance's* " Evidence could ſtand ; and I never went " about to ſupport it. As for *Oates's*, and " *Bedloe's*, and *Prance's* Enformations, they " would make me (ſaith he) renounce any " Thing that dependeth on their Credit." His Lordſhip ſaith again in another of *April* 18, " I believe *Prance* can ſay nothing more than " every one knows of the Murther of Sir *E. G.* " Yet he is beſt able to confute his own Fic- " tions concerning it, and his Word may be " of ſome Credit in this, though of none in " any Thing elſe."

What now could have been the Inducement for his Brother of *Salisbury*, who has ſufficiently declar'd in his Hiſtory the *Popiſh* Plot to be a Fiction, to give Credit to it from a Story told him by Biſhop *Lloyd*, quoted in

* On the Death of Sir *Edmondbury Godfrey*, p. 85.

the

the Notes upon *Rapin?* ‡ " After *Prance* had " declar'd before the King and Council, that " his firſt Confeſſion was all a Fiction, he was " carried back to Priſon; but immediately ſent " the Keeper of *Newgate* to the King, to tell " him that all he had ſworn was true, but that " the Horror and Confuſion he was in, put him " on denying it. Yet he went off from this " again, and denied every thing. Dr. *Lloyd* " was upon this ſent to talk with him. At firſt " he denied every thing to him. But Dr. " *Lloyd* told me, that he was almoſt dead, " through the Diſorder of his Mind, and with " Cold in his Body. But after that Dr. *Lloyd* " had made a Fire, and caus'd him to be put " in a Bed, and began to diſcourſe the Matter " with him, he return'd to his Confeſſion, " which he did in ſuch a Manner, that Dr. " *Lloyd* ſaid to me, it was not poſſible for him " to doubt of his Sincerity in it. "

Is not this making the Doctor talk like *Prance?* The ſecond Part of Biſhop *Burnet's* Life ought to clear up this Matter.

SUPPOSING both theſe Things to be true; that Dr. *Lloyd* told Dr. *Burnet*, he thought *Prance* ſincere; and the other, that he never ſaw how *Prance's* Evidence could ſtand, and that he never went about to ſupport it: There may, ſurely, be found ſome Method of clearing that learned Prelate from ſuch a Charge.

IT is probable, that Dr. *Lloyd* ſaid the firſt to Dr. *Burnet* ſoon after he came from *Prance*; not having the ſame Prejudices againſt *Prance* as his Behaviour afterwards, and the Behaviour

‡ *Rapin*, p. 179.

of the other Witneſſes afterwards gave him. A Man may be for a Time impos'd upon, and believe a Perſon ſincere, till ſubſequent Actions bring him to alter his Opinion. And, perhaps, the Death of *Berry*, accus'd by *Prance*, did ſomething towards the Alteration, who died a Proteſtant; of whom Dr. *Burnet* ſaith, * "Dr. "*Lloyd* attended him, and was much perſuaded "of his Sincerity." To this may be added, the Behaviour of *Tuberville*, another Plot-Evidence, to Dr. *Lloyd*, as mention'd by Biſhop *Burnet*, on the Year 1680.

THERE there are, doubtleſs, many Perſons alive, who once believ'd *Oates*, *Bedloe*, *Prance*, and the reſt, who have, from good Reaſon, alter'd their Opinion. And if Dr. *Lloyd* was one of theſe, it was ill-treating him, to publiſh this his firſt Opinion, which he ſo formally has recanted; unleſs it were done to ſhew the Fallibility of Mankind: But then, that Opinion in which he has declar'd himſelf deceiv'd, ought not to be deliver'd to Poſterity ſingly, only to ſerve a Cauſe. There are other Things which have been readily ſwallow'd, and by Dr. *Lloyd* amongſt the reſt, which have been ſince given up by the Believers, and publickly own'd to be Impoſture.

IT is hard to ſay, why Mr. *Echard* gives *Rapin* this Advantage of complaining, that Facts are related without their Vouchers. And it is as hard to find a Pretence for *Rapin*'s calling him to Account for it. Had the laſt-nam'd Author been bound to prove All he ſaith, what would become of many an uſeful Story? The

* On the Year 1678.

Arch-

Archdeacon could have found Vouchers, for what he ſaith, in the *Paper-Office*; but he was afraid, the general Averſion to Sir *Roger's* Writings would have damped the Opinion of his Hiſtory. He might certainly have ventur'd to quote him here, and referr'd the Reader to his Proofs. If any Thing can be made out, this is, That the Witneſſes to the Truth of the Plot, are abandon'd perjur'd Wretches: That their Evidence notoriouſly diſagrees: That there has not been one Thing happening ſince, that has added to the Credit of their Teſtimony in ſo many Years: That the Practice of torturing other Men into being Witneſſes, is ſufficiently prov'd by Sir *Roger*. Whence may be concluded, that it is too great Deference paid to a Sort of Men, that Truth may not be produc'd for the Confuſion of Impoſtors. The monſtrous Corruption and Forgery on this Part, with the Eaſineſs of Belief on the other, would be ſeen through, if the beſt Evidences were attended to.

RAPIN, being a Retainer to the profeſs'd Enemies of the Name of *Stuart*, pretends to give a Character of *Charles* II. The Authors he frames this out of, are Biſhop *Burnet* and Lord *M*———. The firſt he concludes to be an Enemy, the ſecond a Friend. So that whatever theſe two agree in, according to his Logick, muſt be true.

WITH as great Submiſſion to theſe Authorities, and to Mr. *Rapin's*, as is due, I deſire the Reader to conſider, whether both theſe Characters are not Satires upon the King? And, if that appears, whether we ought to have any Regard to the Determination of the Third, who

who had never produc'd them, but to ſuch a Purpoſe, as his former Performances do ſufficiently evidence?

He wants not, indeed, his Bows and Cringes, his Excuſes for ſpeaking Truth, his Pretences of Impartiality, common Forms of introducing Libel. He gives us Reaſon to ſuſpect *his famous Prelate*, as he calls him †, of an *Attachment* to ſomething very different from Truth. He was "by Birth a *Scotſman*, by Education "a *Presbyterian*,——and that the Reader ought "to be upon his Guard againſt every Thing he "ſays, which does not ſquare with the known "Actions of *Charles* II. or which is contradicted by others."

Notwithstanding this, he concludes, ‖ "Such Expreſſions excepted, which diſcover "ſome Paſſion in the Author, the reſt of "*Charles* the Second's Character, as left us by "the Biſhop, is true in the main.

He brings theſe Objections to the Biſhop's Credit, then aſſerts the Character given by him true in the main: That is, it is proper ſuch Scandal ſhould be propagated, though the Man from whom it comes deſerves no Credit, being over-run by Prejudice and Paſſion.

I would admit the Man a *famous Prelate*, notwithſtanding his Birth and Education, had Mr. *Rapin* ſhew'd one Proof of his Fame as a Prelate. His *Attachment to the Church*, any otherwiſe than by receiving her Revenues, does not appear to every body. When the Services he has done for the *Church*, excluſive of his own Intereſt, appear; when the moſt zealous Sons

† Vol. XIV. p. 385. ‖ Page 386.

of

of the *Church*, I dont mean of the *Kirk*, recommend him to our good Opinion, nobody will deny it.

But let Mr. *Rapin* take along with him the Character he has given of King *William*, and he muſt ſay he doth not believe him there. Why then ſhould a Man be ſet up to give a Character of one King, whom nobody believes in the Character of another? Was it Birth, Education, Paſſion, or what, that has made him paint his Favourite and Benefactor ſo? He rakes into the *Sinks* of Kings, to make them ridiculous. * Nothing is ſo private or ſo filthy, but he will have a hand in it. He ſcarifies his Patron's Memory with deeper Cuts than any body elſe has given him, and, for aught appears, without Foundation.

Is this the Man pick'd out by *Rapin* to ſhew King *Charles*? It was not in his Nature to give an amiable Piece, none but Tempeſt, Treachery, and Confuſion.

As to his other Authority, which he pretends to offer to take off from the ſevere Strokes of his *Famous Prelate*, he makes him a *Deiſt*, by which is meant, or nothing, an *Atheiſt*. He begins with a Hint not to truſt this Advocate too far, calling him *Deiſt*. But he need not have been ſo angry with him, for he has ſhew'd the worſt Side of the Monarch; and rather diſcover'd his own Skill and his own Delight in Satire, than an Inclination to commend where he might. Theſe, it ſeems, are good enough to give Characters of Kings. Such as this is fit only to be read by Men upon his own Level,

* *Rapin*, Vol. XIV. p. 371.

who

who delight to make others as bad as themſelves. Will a Man ask a Gameſter, and none of the beſt of them, to paint out the Virtues of any Perſon? 'Tis out of his Way to deſcribe what he has no Eſteem for.

SURELY there were many Virtues in this Prince conſpicuous enough to be remember'd. Theſe, though they excuſe not Faults and Defects, ought not to be given up to Men of Deſign and Envy, who are Enemies to an advantageous Character in Kings and in Subjects too.

AS to the trifling Story of the King's being poiſon'd, founded upon the Dutcheſs of *Portſmouth*'s Relation to Mr. *Henley*, he that thinks it worth Enquiry, may look at Lord *Lanſdown*'s Account of that Matter lately publiſh'd, in which he may ſee *Rapin*'s *famous* Giver of Characters juſtly reprehended.

THE Notes upon this Hiſtory do again ſurprize us upon *James* II. * "Father *Orleans*, "who wrote from the Mouth of *James* II. not "being able to deny theſe barbarous Executions, endeavours to excuſe them two Ways. "He ſaith, in the firſt Place, the King was in"form'd of them too late to prevent them, and "that the great Services perform'd by *Jeoffreys* "and *Kirk*, prevail'd with him to ſpare them. "In the next Place, that the King made "Amends for thoſe Injuſtices, as far as lay in "his Power, by the general Pardon he granted "afterwards."

THE Commentator ſaith, † "Here it is "evident *Rapin* ſaw not *Burnet*, who aſſures us,

* *Rapin*, Vol. XV. p. 47. † Ibid.

that

" that the King had a particular Account of " all *Jeoffreys*'s Proceedings writ to him every " Day; and he took Pleaſure to relate them " in the Drawing-Room to Foreign Miniſters, " and at his Table, calling it *Jeoffreys*'s Cam- " pain. "

IT is very evident from the Proofs already given, particularly on the Death of *Charles* II. that *Rapin* had read *Burnet*: For he quotes at large *Burnet*'s Character of that Prince, with another by Lord *Mulgrave*, with a long Account of *Charles* the Second's Death from *Burnet*. He owns the ſame Thing within 80 Pages of the Remark laſt quoted. * " But he who " has been moſt circumſtantial in this Affair, " is Dr. *Burnet* Biſhop of *Salisbury*, in the Hiſ- " tory of his own Time, publiſh'd ſince his " Death. As this Hiſtory will ſhortly appear " in *French*, I might ſeem to be excus'd from " tranſcribing here what that *illuſtrious Author* " ſays concerning this Matter. ".

THIS Point being, I preſume, clear'd, that *Rapin* had read *Burnet*, where he has not thought fit to follow him, we are left to our Gueſſes, by what Means this could come to paſs. Here he is call'd, *That Illuſtrious Author*, and upon the Death of King *Charles*, treated in a much more homely Manner. There have been, perhaps, as many *Rapins* as *Dryden* makes *Soſias*, and, perhaps, as many more. The Parts may have been compiled by different Hands, only the main Features drawn by the Maſter. Why elſe is an Author at one Time to be highly miſtruſted, at another Time to be

* Page 121.

call'd *Illuſtrious*, and in a third Inſtance not to be mention'd at all? Unleſs the Reaſon of not mentioning him be found in the firſt of the Three, that he is ſhrewdly to be ſuſpected.

If the Reader will look back to the Biſhop of *Salisbury*'s Character of *Charles* the Second, as quoted by one *Rapin*, he will find it to be taken with Grains of Allowance; indeed with Drams, nay Ounces of Allowance. *Rapin* has ſo arm'd his Reader againſt being impos'd upon by Dr. *Burnet*, that it's ſurprizing to find him afterwards an *Illuſtrious Author*.

In ſo material a Point as this, that *James* II. ſhould be excus'd from appointing the frequent Executions in the Weſt, and delighting to hear of Cruelties, it is thought ſtrange that an Author of *Rapin*'s Mould ſhould ſo imprudently take off the Monarch's Load. Yet has one of the *Rapins* choſen to do it, believing even a *Jeſuit*'s Account, rather than the Account of the Biſhop, againſt whoſe Poiſon he had ſwallow'd ſo many Grains of Allowance, and preſcrib'd the ſame Doſe to his Readers.

RAPIN, we find, is not yet compleat. We muſt expect ſome future *Expurgators* to reform the Performance; that there may be no Beauty unexpreſs'd in the Illuſtrious, no Wrinkle omitted in the Undeſerving.

The next Piece of Hiſtory that wants to be reſcued out of the Hands of the *Rapiniers* is this; † "Now the *Tories* had a quite diffe-"rent Notion of the Regal Power from that "of the *Whigs*. They had, as we have ſeen, "declar'd in the late Reign for the Doctrine

† Page 58.

"of

" of *Paſſive Obedience* and *Non-Reſiſtance*; and " the Church of *England* had made it an Ar- " ticle of Faith. "

THAT the Church of *England* ever made any thing an Article of Faith which is not contain'd in the Creeds, Mr. *Rapin* would have done well to prove, and to quote his Authors for. The Church of *England* held Obedience to Princes due, actual Obedience, ſo far as the Laws entitled Princes to their Obedience. Where the Obedience would have been ſinful, the Church had not oblig'd her Members to obey. Let Mr. *Rapin* ſhew where ſhe had. The whole ſhe maintain'd, was, that Subjects were to ſuffer rather than to ſin. Even this is no where to be found as an Article of Faith; but in the Moral Law, upon the foot of God's Authority, conveyed as well to the Publick Parent as to the Private.

MR. *Rapin* would have done well to diſtinguiſh between an Act of the Church of *England*, and an Act of ſome in her Communion. An Act of the Church cannot appear but in a Synod: And the Church is not anſwerable for what her Members may act, exceeding or falling ſhort of her Appointments. Yet whenever Mr. *Rapin* thinks he has an Advantage over her Sons, he takes Care to lay it upon the Mother; deſigning to render her Conſtitution odious, by the Fault, or Error, or Neglect of theſe. This Sort of Sophiſtry runs through his whole Work, which was intended to unſettle Men from Church-Principles, by expoſing the Behaviour of the moſt zealous Churchmen.

LET us hear him; * "That Time being "come under *James* II. the Church of *Eng-* "*land* open'd her Eyes, though ſomething of "the lateſt, and ſaw that ſhe had been labour- "ing for her own Deſtruction, in an avow'd "Maintenance and Preaching of *Paſſive Obedi-* "*ence, without any Reſtriction.*"

ADMITTING it juſt to call the Majority of Churchmen, The Church of *England*, where does Mr. *Rapin* find this in their Printed Sermons or Proceſſes againſt them?

WHERE does he find, that Subjects were charg'd to pay Taxes which were not granted by Parliament? Where does he find a Prince flatter'd with a Power to demand their Property illegally? Where does he find any thing more than that they were to treat him as a Parent, to forbear Rebellion and Revenge, though he had neglected the Duty and Obligation of a Parent?

WE have an Account of the Perſecutions the Diſſenters ſuffer'd from the Church of *England*, and the Church's Repentance of that Perſecution. ‡ "The King, to ſecure Succeſs "to his Deſign, made the Hardſhips and Per- "ſecutions which the Nonconformiſts had ſuf- "fer'd from the Church of *England*, the com- "mon Topicks of his Diſcourſe in all Conver- "ſations. No greater Pleaſure could be done "him, than to entertain him with the Parti- "culars of thoſe Oppreſſions."

WHATEVER theſe Hardſhips and Perſecutions were, they came not from the Church of *England*, let Mr. *Rapin* affirm it as often as he

* Page 149. ‡ Page 90.

will.

will. They were neither appointed by Church-Authority, nor executed by Church-Power. They were appointed and inflicted by the State, who took that Method to quell Diſturbance and Sedition. The Makers of theſe Laws, and they who executed them, were Members of the Church, but let Mr. *Rapin* call them to Account as Members of Parliament.

Is this an honeſt Way of writing Hiſtory, to ſtuff it with Satires upon the Church, founded upon Falſhood and Forgery? It is, indeed, of Uſe to propagate Atheiſm, which is like to have a plentiful Harveſt from the Care and Labour of its Votaries. I don't charge Mr. *Rapin* with an original Intention to introduce Atheiſm: But from the Flirts he has had at Religion, the Chriſtian Religion, and the Church of *England* in particular, I need not ſtand in Awe of judging he has done it to obtain the greater Number of Purchaſers, who are not to be ſecur'd by Truth and Fair-dealing, but by being indulg'd in Libertine Notions, and treated with Invectives upon the Clergy. Admitting Gain was his Inducement, 'tis a very ſlender Juſtification. Admitting his Antiepiſcopal Education, and the Company he kept, might found a Prejudice to the Hierarchy, it does not juſtify him in miſrepreſenting Facts, and charging a Body of Men with Diabolical Actions, becauſe they were zealous and conſtant in maintaining Chriſtianity as receiv'd from the pureſt Ages.

It is out of Mr. *Rapin's* Power, and of all his Fellow-Labourers, to ſcribble down the Merit and Character of thoſe he takes upon him to cenſure. There may be an Age when their Learning and Piety will ſhine. And tho'

after

after this Sort of Treatment, the Ignorant and the Vicious will applaud theſe Refiners upon Religion and Hiſtory, they obtain nothing but Contempt and Deteſtation from thoſe of better Life and better Judgment.

And what, at laſt, was it that theſe People ſuffer'd for, upon whoſe Account the Church is to be affronted, and Chriſtianity given up to Free-Thinkers? Was it better than Obſtinacy and Enthuſiaſm? Some Forms and Ceremonies were appointed, by thoſe in Authority to do it: Theſe the Objectors at firſt call'd by no worſe a Name than Indifferent: Theſe, however, they apprehended ſinful, becauſe commanded. Can the Offices of Religion be perform'd without ſome Exterior? Should the Governors have given Offence to the Dutiful and Reaſonable Part of the Family, only to humour froward Children, who would kneel, or ſtand, or ſit, in Oppoſition, they knew not why? From judging of the Expediency of Governors Commands, the next Step was to deny their Authority, and then the Work was done.

The Riſe of theſe Opinions in *England* was principally from indulging Women in being wiſer than their Husbands, and making their Pocket pay for the Experiment. Dr. *Stillingfleet* ‡ was an Author better worth *Rapin*'s conning, than thoſe little trifling Pieces collected for him by his Undertakers. There the Pretences for Separation are fairly ſtated and confuted. At the End of the Work are Letters from ſome of the moſt eminent of the *Hugonot* Miniſters of *France*, who had enquir'd into the

‡ Unreaſonableneſs of Separation.

Reaſons

Reaſons and the Progreſs of this Deluſion. Theſe condemn the Diſſention for want of ſomething ſinful to diſſent from; and wiſh the People's Eyes open'd, to ſubmit to that Authority which was lawfully over them, and which had appointed nothing unbecoming. One of theſe Miniſters particularly mentions a Congregation which he had ſeen crowded with Women, and not above half a Dozen Men there.

Mr. *Rapin* has at length brought the Church of *England* to Repentance; probably out of Vanity, to ſhew he has juſtly condemn'd and ſo conquer'd her. * "The Church of *England* "acknowledg'd that ſhe had carried the *Paſ-* "*ſive-Obedience-Doctrine* too far, and that it "had produc'd bad Effects. She teſtified a "Readineſs to comply with the Scruples of the "*Presbyterians*, by giving up Ceremonies which "might be deem'd as Indifferent, or at leaſt to "leave every Man at Liberty to practice or "not to practice them."

I desire to be inform'd, where this Act of Acknowledgment is to be ſeen; and what is Mr. *Rapin*'s Authority for aſſerting it. If he had given us a Tranſcript of it, it would have been as acceptable to his Leathern-apron'd Readers as any thing he has produc'd. Hiſtorians have great Liberty. *Livy* has put an elegant Speech into the Mouth of *Caradoc* a *Britiſh* Prince, who was carried Captive to *Rome*. Mr. *Rapin* may preſume his own and his Confederate Arms have ſo effectually raz'd the Bulwarks of the Church of *England*, that he may

* Page 150.

make

make her ſpeak, as Captive, what he is pleas'd to dictate.

HAD Mr. *Rapin* kept up to his Maſter *Livy*, he would not have made his Captive ſay what ſo little became her. Would *Livy* have brought in *Caradoc* condemning himſelf for a juſt and brave Defence of his Country? Would he have preſented the Church pulling down her Pale, and owning it was neither juſt nor lawful to erect it? That the Conditions requir'd of her Members, in themſelves innocent and indifferent, had been unjuſtly impos'd? That ſhe would give them up to Scruples without Foundation; and expoſe the Authority committed to her for the Benefit of Mankind, to the Savage Inclination of the Foreſt?

WITH what View could ſhe have done this, but giving up the obedient Part of her Family to be ſeduc'd by Men of Intereſt or Enthuſiaſm?

BUT where are we to find this *Teſtimony of her Readineſs to comply with the Scruples of the* Presbyterians? This is not of ſo long ſtanding as the *Original Contract*; not ſo liable to be miſlaid, worn out, or loſt. And why did not the *Presbyterians* take her in the Humour? What would they have more than their Scruples complied with? It's no great Compliment to them, to ſay the Obſtacle was remov'd, and yet their Obſtinacy remains.

OUR Author, notwithſtanding his Partiality to the Diſſenters, lets them ſometimes know that they too are liable to his Cenſures. * "Never-"theleſs, ſo great had been the Rigour with

* Page 89.

"which

" which the Nonconformiſts had hitherto been
" treated, that it ought not to ſurprize us, that
" they at firſt thought themſelves happy in a
" Deliverance from Perſecution. This was the
" Reaſon of ſo many Addreſſes of Thanks,
" from the ſeveral Sects, for the King's graci-
" ous Declaration. The *Anabaptiſts* led the
" Way: The *Quakers* follow'd, and next came
" the *Independents*; and laſtly the *Presbyte-*
" *rians*. Some of theſe Addreſſes ſpeaking of
" the Royal Power, ſtrain'd it beyond all Mea-
" ſure; becauſe it was then advantageous to
" the *Nonconformiſts* to maintain a Power which
" had deliver'd them from the Conſtraint they
" had hitherto been under. The Members of
" the Church of *England* fail'd not to remark
" this Change: But they could with no good
" Grace blame an Exceſs into which them-
" ſelves had fallen. The Truth is, the two
" Parties neither did then, nor yet do follow
" their own Principles, with relation to the
" Royal Power, on all Occaſions; which they
" extend or contract, as the King is more or
" leſs favourable to them."

We may judge how we are treated, by thoſe that call themſelves our Hiſtorians, in Accounts of Things long ſince paſt, if we examine their Relation of what is within our own Memory. Mr. *Rapin* undertakes to give a Relation of the *Iriſh Fright* 1688. He ſays he came hither on board the *Dutch* Fleet, and therefore probably was here at the *Panic*. Whether he was here or not, he might have inform'd himſelf better than he has inform'd the World. In one Part of the Story he ſeems to know too little, in the

other too much. * " Some *Iriſh* Soldiers of " the disbanded Troops finding themſelves " Money-leſs, and incapable of ſubſiſting in a " Country where they were ſo generally hated, " took it into their Heads to force open a " Country Houſe, to keep themſelves from " ſtarving. Upon this a Man in the Neigh- " bourhood ran directly to *London*, crying, as " he paſs'd, *That the* Iriſh *were up and march-* " *ing to* London, *firing of Houſes, and putting* " *Man, Woman, and Child to the Sword.* The " News immediately flew through the City, " and gave the Inhabitants a Terror which is " not to be expreſs'd. This Terror encreas'd " as the News ſpread, by an Addition of Cir- " cumſtances and Particulars, which ſerv'd to " heighten it. The City was in an Alarm all " Night, expecting every Moment the Arri- " val of the *Iriſh*. Some prepar'd for Flight, " others ran to Arms, not a Window in *Lon-* " *don* and *Weſtminſter* but was illuminated, that " the Streets might not want ſufficient Light " to diſcover the Enemy. From *London* the " Conſternation diffus'd itſelf through the whole " Kingdom, in ſuch Manner, that in the re- " mote Parts, where more Time was allow'd " to view the Danger, and to guard againſt it, " a general Reſolution was taken, ſhould the " News prove true, of making a general Maſ- " ſacre of the *Papiſts*, and particularly of the " *Iriſh*, which ſhould any where be found. " Happily this Terror vaniſh'd in *London*, as " ſoon as the real Cauſe of it was known. "

* Page 213.

And doth Mr. *Rapin* pretend to believe all this owing to the plundering of a Country-Houſe? That the Fright *London* was in diffus'd itſelf as other Things commonly do?

That the Report was publiſh'd in every Country by Perſons planted there on purpoſe, who receiv'd their Orders by the Poſt, 'tis much more probable. Where the Poſt goes in one Day, it was ſet about that Day; where it goes in two Days, it was ſet about on the ſecond Day. That the *Iriſh* had burn'd ſome of the Neighbouring Towns, was conſtantly affirm'd in all Parts of *England* on the firſt or on the ſecond Day. Suppoſing the Intelligence diffus'd itſelf from *London*, how could the Men of *Berkſhire*, *Lincolnſhire*, *Suſſex*, have from thence an Account that the *Iriſh* were in their Neighbourhood? And how could this happen ſo exactly at the ſame Time in all Places, with one Day's Difference only, neceſſary for the firing the Train. People in many Countries had the Curioſity to enquire from whom they receiv'd the Alarm; and when they had traced it from one to another, the firſt was told it by one he did not know. There are enough alive to determine, whether Mr. *Rapin*'s Accident, or a form'd Deſign brought the Fright about.

THE general Reſolution that was taken, in remote Countries, to maſſacre the *Papiſts* and *Iriſh*, ſhould the News prove true, is, I believe, yet News to thoſe that liv'd at the Time. Nor was there Time for a general Reſolution: The Thing vaniſh'd in twenty-four Hours, if not in twelve; for the Towns ſaid to be on Fire, were within twenty Miles, or nearer, to the Place where the Report was taken up.

WHAT was the Reſolution of the Projectors, Mr. *Rapin* may know more than another. It would be judging hardly of the Authors of the Stratagem, to ſay they meant a Maſſacre. Perhaps they intended no more than the *Panick* which was rais'd. But they could not be ſure of bridling their Charm, ſo that it ſhould not exceed their Intention. They could not be ſure the Execution ſhould not be over before People had Leiſure to enquire into the *Truth of the News*, of which every Man ſeem'd to want no farther Proof. If no more was deſign'd than came to paſs, there's room enough to applaud the Dexterity or the Fortune of the Contrivers.

I TAKE Leave of Mr. *Rapin* in his *Interregnum* *, where he abdicates the Doctrine of *Paſſive-Obedience* and *Non-Reſiſtance*. He might as well have engag'd a Windmill: For here he ſhews he underſtands not one Word of the Controverſy. "They *(the Biſhops)* perceiv'd then "it was abſolutely neceſſary to ſet Bounds to "the Regal Authority, and were themſelves "the firſt to do it, by refuſing to read the De"claration for Toleration. Herein they acted "directly contrary to the Principle of *Paſſive-*"*Obedience* and *Non-Reſiſtance*, maintain'd be"fore with ſo much Earneſtneſs by the Church "of *England*."

HAS this Author blotted ſo much Paper to teach himſelf and us, That diſobeying an unlawful Command is what was meant by RESISTANCE? This is the (would-be) Expoſitor of the Church of *England*'s Doctrine;

* Page 238.

charging

charging her with Levity and Change, without bringing one Inſtance where ſhe has chang'd, or ought to change: This the Hiſtoriographer, who triumphs over our beſt Writers, upon the Strength of Nurſery-Stories, and Coffee-Houſe Chat, tagg'd with idle and inconſiſtent Reflections.

FINIS.

70
FEB